LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF
R. C. Root
Class

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/worldfederation00truerich

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD

BY

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL. D.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
The Riverside Press, Cambridge

JX1953
.T73

Pacific
R. C. Root

COPYRIGHT, 1899, BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIRD EDITION

TO
THE FRIENDS OF PEACE
IN
AMERICA AND EUROPE

184995

Pax quærenda pace

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

IN publishing this third edition, now eight years after the appearance of the first, I have not deemed it wise to make any material changes in what was then written. The nature of the argument, as an interpretation of the forces and movements then clearly seeming to me to be rapidly working out the federation and peace of the world, is such that it could not well be made more forcible by recasting it into another form. The recent extraordinary progress of the nations, in spite of the persistence of the rivalry of armaments, toward the ideal attainment then forecast is made all the more striking by presenting it, as is done in the last two chapters, alongside the prediction at that time written down. The ten chapters have there-

fore been left standing substantially as they were, with only a few corrections and minor changes made necessary by the lapse of time. The foot-notes have been slightly modified in places, to enable the reader the better to contrast the state of international affairs eight years ago with that at the present time. The eleventh chapter, though never before published, was written soon after the Hague Conference of 1899, during which it was my privilege to be at The Hague, and was an attempt to interpret the work of that remarkable gathering and its bearing upon the future relations of the nations. In the twelfth chapter I have attempted to set forth the chief features of the progress of the federative movement since the close of that Conference and the establishment and opening of the permanent International Court of Abitration. I have included in this exposition a brief account of the work and results of the Second Hague Conference, which has just closed its labors.

BOSTON, December, 1907.

PREFACE

THE substance of what is found on the following pages was originally given in two lectures delivered before the faculty and students of the Meadville Theological School, Meadville, Pennsylvania, in the spring of 1897, on the Adin Ballou foundation. The lectures have since been carefully revised and considerably expanded, and are now given to the public for the first time. The surpassing interest of the subject discussed is my only justification in venturing to bring my thought before a larger number of hearers than was reached when the lectures were given. The conclusions reached are the result of many years of careful study of the international movements of modern society and their causes, and they cannot be fairly judged except from the point of view of these movements.

The treatment is original, so far as a great thought, occupying many minds and mouths at the same time, can be treated in an original way by any one person, whose thinking owes so much to that of others. The argument is not intended to be exhaustive, but only suggestive and directive, and it is hoped that it is presented in such a way as to furnish encouragement and inspiration to duty.

The reader will kindly bear in mind that the subject treated is not primarily that of peace and war. These receive a large amount of attention, but only as they are related to the general subject, the federation of the world. The aim of the discussion is to show that the nature of man and of society is such as to indicate that a general federation of the race ought to exist, that war ought to be abolished, that the whole of humanity must move together in harmonious coöperation if it ever fulfills its destiny; to point out the reasons why this federation has been so long delayed; to indicate the

influences which have been at work liberating and restoring the federative elements; and to show from actual historic movements and recent social and international achievements that the social and political unity of the world is a consummation rationally to be expected in the not remote future.

B. F. T.

BOSTON, February, 1899.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction 1

I. *The Solidarity of Humanity* . . . 7

II. *Solidarity Unrealized* 21

III. *The Causes of the Disunity* . . . 27

IV. *The Development of the War System* . . 40

V. *The Influence of Christianity in restoring the Federative Principle* 56

VI. *War Ethically Wrong* 68

VII. *War Anti-Federative* 80

VIII. *The New World Society* 91

IX. *The Growing Triumph of Arbitration* . 102

X. *The United States of the World* . . . 118

XI. *The First Hague Peace Conference* . . 150

XII. *The Hague Court and Recent Progress toward World-Unity* 188

Appendix 215

Bibliography 219

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD

INTRODUCTION

WAS Tennyson's dream of "the parliament of man, the federation of the world," [1] nothing but a poetic fancy, or was it a rational prophecy of an actual condition to be realized in some future, near or far? Is a federation of the world possible? Is it desirable? Is it necessary as an expression of the true nature of the human race, and of its purpose on the earth? If so, what are the signs of its coming? By what means is it to be realized, and in what form? How are the obstacles to its realization to be gotten out of the way?

[1] Tennyson, *Locksley Hall.*

The movements of our time, embracing as they do the whole earth in their compass, are raising these questions in many minds. No more momentous questions, none more startling, none more inspiring, have ever been raised. They involve the widest, the deepest, the most enduring interests of individuals and of nations, singly and combined, in the ages to come. In them are involved also many smaller weighty questions, the solution of which has puzzled, and continues to puzzle, men's brains, — questions of commerce, of finance, of labor and capital, etc., — the solution of which will come about naturally and easily when the larger problems have been disposed of.

The following pages are an attempt to discover what light is thrown upon these questions by the nature of man, the constitution of society, the past and present relations of the nations to one another, and the progress of the federative principle during the century now closing. By way of intro-

duction to the discussion, I may say at the outset that my own mind has reached the clear and settled conviction that a federation of the world is not only possible and easy of attainment, but that it is desirable in the extreme as a fundamental social necessity. A great international state,[1] coextensive with the surface of the globe, with some sort of government directing the general interests of the race and compatible with local self-government, is the necessary and inevitable outgrowth of the nature of man and of society, under the action of the divinely ordained social processes, and that regeneration and reconstruction of humanity which Christianity is bringing about.

[1] Kant, *Perpetual Peace*, Second Section, 2, near the end. Kant was the first to give us the idea of a great international state. He does not seem, however, to have believed such a state possible. He pleads for a voluntary federation of states as the only realizable means for putting an end to international violence. Of the nature of this federation he gives no clear conception.

The question of the peace of the world, universal and perpetual, is now one of the uppermost in all thoughtful minds. Even those who do not believe that such a state of human society is desirable or realizable are compelled to struggle with the idea.[1] Universal peace, which seemed a little while ago the dream of disordered brains, has suddenly transformed itself into the waking vision of the soberest and clearest of intellects. This world-peace, the signs of whose coming are now many and unmistakable, will not be established between men and nations as so many separate units or groups, standing apart with different and unshared interests, agreeing to let each other alone and to respect each other's rights at a dis-

[1] Von Moltke was accustomed to say: "Permanent peace is a dream, and not even a beautiful dream, and war is a law of God's order in the world, by which the noblest virtues of man, courage and self-denial, loyalty and self-sacrifice, even to the point of death, are developed. Without war the world would deteriorate into materialism." — *Von Moltke as a Correspondent*, translated by Mary Herms.

tance. Such a peace, even if it were possible, would be at best only a negative one, having little vitality and little power for good. Universal peace will come rather through federation and coöperation. The nature of man remaining as it is, it can come in no other way. The war-drum will continue to throb and battle-flags to beat the wind, armies to be equipped and navies to be built, until men and nations not only consider themselves "members one of another," but until they in some large way treat each other so. All progress in peace and toward final peace which has been already made has been made primarily along this positive line. Abstinence from smiting with the fist or with the sword is in large measure the expression in a negative way of a change in men's dispositions toward each other, which results in positive mutual beneficence. In this changed disposition the fist spontaneously opens and the sword falls from the hand. When the day of universal peace arrives, it will not

find all hatred and disposition to do evil gone, but it will find men and nations so strongly united in the bonds of kindly fellowship and mutual service as to render the disintegrating forces of ill-will practically powerless, — powerless, at any rate, to do mischief on a large scale.

I

The Solidarity of Humanity

FEDERATION finds its fundamental reason and its primal necessity in the constitution of humanity. The human race is one race. God "made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The oneness of origin and descent of the various peoples of the globe is now established with practical certainty on purely scientific grounds.[1] In constitution also is the race one race. The human body, of black or white, of red or yellow, is the same in structure, in purpose and in needs, the world over. The human mind is everywhere built on the same pattern. The highest man and the lowest man can learn each other's language and commune with each other intellectu-

[1] Darwin, *Descent of Man*, Part I., chap. vii.

ally. Human feelings in all individuals and in all races are the same feelings, however they may vary in degree or manner of expression. Pleasure and pain, joy and grief, hope and fear, love and hate, are the same affections wherever experienced. The power of moral determination, though varying widely in its range of activity, is operative in all men, and the capacity for the same moral ideals is likewise everywhere found. This constitutional unity of the race is practically meaningless on any other theory than that of coöperation and mutual service in working out the destiny of each and all.

The oneness and solidarity of humanity are more strikingly apparent from another point of view. Men need each other; they cannot live without each other. Husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, live through and for one another. Beyond the family circle, neighbor needs neighbor, one family another family, one community another community. The fam-

ily that eats all its own wheat and corn, its own pork and beans, that weaves its own cloth out of home-grown fibres, that makes its own clothing, tans its own leather, makes its own boots and shoes, shoes its own horses; that sells nothing and buys nothing from others, that has no minister or teacher outside of its own members, may become a keen and shrewd, nay, even a good little society within its own narrow limits. Such a family, if it were possible, would, however, lead a meagre and precarious existence, and always remain a narrow and stunted society. Its members could not rise high in the scale of that intelligence, largeness of spirit, self-control, and altruistic thoughtfulness which constitute men truly human. So strongly is the need of the companionship and help of others felt, for spiritual as well as for commercial reasons, that families have rarely been willing to live in this isolated way, except under the stress of great necessity, as in pioneer life. Not only in the great migrations of history,

but in all sorts of colonial settlements, men have gone together in companies larger or smaller. So great is the enjoyment as well as the practical necessity of association, that most families would rather live near one another and fight than at a distance and be at peace.

Social dependence and the necessity of mutual helpfulness, as fundamental facts of human nature, grow much more marked as the race becomes more numerous and society more complex. A farmer whose family has given up or never learned shoemaking, horseshoeing, weaving, spinning, and the like, because it is more profitable and agreeable to follow agriculture as a specialty, becomes poverty-stricken and helpless the moment he finds himself unable to deal with the stock-buyers, grain-merchants and grocers. He may complain of the village or city as much as he likes, of its dainty-fingered inhabitants and of all the lines of trade which centre there, but you will see him heading that way

every week just the same. The city folk, too, may look with something like contempt on the "long whiskers," the "horny hands" and the workaday clothes of the country people, but they are always delighted to see them come in with their loads of grain, their buckets of butter and their fluttering coops of ducks and chickens.

Any great city like New York or London, in the advanced state of social development which such a city implies, is always within a week of starvation[1] if suddenly cut off from the rest of the world. Every clime and every industry contributes daily to the supply of its needs. It raises not a bushel of wheat, not a load of corn. It fats no beeves or swine. It produces not a ton of coal, not a board of lumber. The wool and cotton which it uses are grown far away

[1] Edward Atkinson, speech at the American Conference on International Arbitration, held at Washington, D. C., April 22 and 23, 1896, says that the world is always within a year or less of starvation. See Report, p. 47.

from its borders. When the carts cease to come in from the suburban gardens, the trains of freight to thunder into its stations, or the boats of merchandise to drop anchor in its harbor, it becomes at once as helpless as a child, and begins to cry out for the breast of the great world-mother. A strike on a modern street-car line deranges the plans of every home in a city; a strike on a great railway system throws every corner of the land into confusion.

This interlacing and interdependence of individuals, of families, of communities and of classes, in every relation of life, might be traced out, with interest and profit, *ad libitum.* But the lesson is as clear from the cases given as it could be made by any multiplication of the number. The curious thing about this fact is that men in their normal condition create, spontaneously and intentionally, by the very necessities of their nature, the conditions which, while making them indefinitely stronger and more prosperous when united with their fellow-

men, render them more and more helpless when left to themselves.

The dependence of nations on one another is exactly the same in kind, though at first sight not so apparent. The fact that some of them occupy large sections of the earth's surface, and have such a wide range of interdependent activities within their borders, has led some people to the hasty conclusion that they are exceptions to the great law of human interdependence. Only in them, however, does this law have its final, its highest and most efficient fulfillment. Our time is rapidly discovering this to be true, and this discovery is to prove the greatest lever for lifting the world that has ever been dreamed of. Great deeds of unsurpassed beneficence will be wrought when the whole race shall put forth its intellectual, moral and social powers in the freest and fullest combination and harmony. This is a prophecy which is even now writing itself legibly on society without the intervention of a man's hand.

As has often been stated by economists, some nations are so situated in respect of the physical conditions of the earth that they would lead a half-starved existence if compelled to live without intercourse with others. The whole of Great Britain, with her present dense population, would soon grow almost as poor as the poorest sections of Ireland if it were not for her large intercourse with other lands. At the present time this intercourse furnishes the basis of nearly all the occupations by which her citizens live and prosper. Many of the wars of former times had their root-cause, in considerable measure, in this international, inter-racial or inter-tribal need. People were too selfish and narrow to satisfy this need in a normal and friendly way, and hence were driven by their necessities to try to satisfy it in the barbarous and destructive way of war. Much of the friction still existing between the nations results from the pressure of this imperious necessity of international traffic against the selfish and short-

sighted nationalism which erects barriers of one kind and another to shut off one section of the earth from natural and healthy intercourse with other sections. The pressure will continue until it has conquered and destroyed the spirit of national exclusiveness; for however illiberal any people may itself be, no people is willing to be shut out from participating in the advantages which others possess over it. It feels that it has a natural right to a share in whatever blessings any portion of the earth offers, and all nations will insist on this right until they obtain it — and, what is more, till they become large-hearted and sensible enough to *give* it.

In matters pertaining to mind and character also, nations are the complements one of another. France and Germany are not more unlike in soil and climate than they are in the physical and psychical characteristics of their people. This statement is not intended to cover up the fact that these two great peoples, as any other two peoples,

have more similarities than differences. But the differences between them are so marked that they greatly need each other, in order that they may both do the most for their own material and spiritual development and for the civilization of the world. The estrangement between them, because of the evil influences of the utterly inhuman system of militarism, is wholly unnatural. They ought to be, normally, the greatest friends in Europe. If the money which they spend and the effort which they put forth in trying to outwit and humiliate each other were employed by them in doing each other mutual services, they would be the two central pillars of European civilization. As it is, their service to humanity is very much neutralized by their intense mutual antipathy. They are the peril of the whole Old World, the peril of all the acquisitions of civilization. A similar charge may be brought against a number of other nations in their own spheres. The stupendous iniquity and the far-working mischievousness

of national self-sufficiency are coming to be clearly recognized by an increasing number of people in all countries, to whom the truth has impressively come that nations cannot, any more than individuals, live unto themselves.

All well-read persons are familiar with the thought, often expressed by a certain class of our citizens, that the United States, because of the greatness of her territory, the variety of her soil and climate, the vigor and intelligence of her people, could and should live unto herself; that she should produce everything which she consumes, and in general get on without the rest of the world. A great variety of excessively righteous and patriotic motives are given in support of this position. This view has just enough superficial reasons in its favor to carry away people of narrow vision and little thought. It is the kind of intellectual pabulum which the hurrah-patriots deal out, highly seasoned, in unstinted quantities to their sentimental followers. But this theory consist-

ently carried out, as the chauvinists, its originators, never do carry it out, would require us to keep at home the billion and a half of dollars' worth of products which we annually sell to the rest of the world, call home all our diplomatic and consular representatives abroad, shut out all foreign comers, cease to travel among other peoples, take all our ships off the ocean, write all the books and papers which we read, create our own science, our own art, our own everything. The theory needs only to be stated clearly, to receive immediate and utter condemnation. What these selfish, narrow-minded people really mean is that we should get all we can out of other peoples, and give little or nothing in return, — a position repugnant to every principle of justice and honor, of economic development and prosperity.

It is unquestionably true that the United States could live alone, and live better than any other section of the world could so live. But we could not live thus as we

ought to live,—the large, rich, human, useful life that we have been in a measure living, and that we are destined more and more to live, if we keep clear of the sin of hating, irritating, and fighting other peoples. The United States is not the whole world. There are numberless treasures which we do not possess. There are things which we can never grow, or grow only with great waste of energy. There are markets which we cannot duplicate at home, and whole argosies of products which we must sell abroad or let perish in field or storehouse. There are phenomena of earth and sea and sky which no citizen of this country has seen, or can see, without crossing the seas. In brains as well as in climate God has not given us everything. There are thoughts which we cannot think, originally. There are books which we never could have written, discoveries of science which we could not have made, conceptions of high art entirely beyond our intellectual range. We draw

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

our life from everywhere. We owe our very existence to the Old World. Europe is the mother of us all. Our history all begins on the other side of the sea. Our life is fed thence in a thousand ways. The Old World and the New are, commercially, intellectually, morally and socially, as much parts of each other as the two halves of the planet. The same is true of all parts of the race in reference to one another, as might be illustrated indefinitely. If there is any earthly fact perfectly clear to all sane minds, it is that the human race, physically, intellectually, morally, socially, economically, is one race; that it has one great joint habitation, one broad varied field for the exercise and unfolding of its capacities; that its interests are one, that it has a common destiny.

NOTE. There has been marked improvement in the attitude of France and Germany toward each other since this book was first published in 1899. What is said, therefore, on page 16 is no longer a just statement in regard to them. Witness the Algeciras Conference, the events connected with the Courrières disaster, etc.

II

Solidarity Unrealized

THIS solidarity of humanity, founded in the constitutional unity of the race, and in that divergence in characteristics which renders all peoples necessary to one another for the highest individual, national and racial development, has as yet been poorly realized. Between many parts of the world there have appeared but the vaguest traces of it. Between great nations, calling themselves civilized and Christian, there is still an appalling lack of it. They have accepted as much of it as the irresistible tide of progress has compelled them to accept. Along a few lines voluntary efforts have been made to realize solidarity in its world-wide aspects, but these have been weakened and much hidden from view by the

continuance of the old struggle for individual and national mastery, with its blind disregard for the rights of others and their power of return services.

The sin of the world has been that the race of man, instead of being a loving, co-operating, united race, as it was destined to be, and as it some day will be, has been a hating, fighting, distracted, broken one. The law of life in general has been every man for himself and against every other man as much as necessary for selfish ends. Of the exceptions to this law and of the movements of another law, "struggle for the life of others," [1] something will be said later. Even in the family, where from the beginning of history the sense of dependence, of regard for others, of solidarity, has been most strongly felt, the law of hate and strife has held sway. If the world's history could be fully written, no chapter would be more distressingly interesting than that on family quarrels. It would

[1] Henry Drummond, *The Ascent of Man*, chap. vii.

be copious enough to satisfy the curiosity of the most confirmed gossip-monger. It would be well for the world if its other quarrels had been attended by as much feeling of shame, and they had been as carefully concealed as its family quarrels.

When the first families began to branch off and to develop into tribes, the feeling of oneness and solidarity, which, in spite of strife and contention, had been preserved to a considerable degree by the immediate necessities and affections of the family, began rapidly to disappear. Appetite, passion, greed, the desire for mastery, prevailed over the sense of kinship, right and duty. Within the various tribes, beginning from each particular family, the same process went on, resulting in internal strife and division. A little way down the diverging lines of descent the sense of kinship and fellowship often, in appearance at least, disappeared entirely. Forests, rivers and mountains, once passed, made intercommunication difficult; means of preserving an-

cestral records were few; language changed rapidly; and as the clans and tribes wandered on they often became entirely unknown one to another, and to those left behind. In this way, when by any chance peoples in their wanderings met, or fell in with other peoples of more fixed habitation, they came to seem to one another of an entirely different race and origin, or, if kinship was suspected, the sense of it was overpowered by the selfish instincts and determinations.

Neighboring tribes sometimes preserved some feeling of oneness and mutual interest, especially where their dispositions and physical surroundings kept them for long periods in the same region until they developed into a people more or less homogeneous, or where they found themselves compelled to unite in common defense against aggressors. But neighboring tribes more often fell into strife and engaged in petit wars of conquest and revenge. Feuds grew up which lasted generation after gen-

eration. Strong tribes became aggressors and enslaved weaker ones. The leaders of the conquering tribes became warrior kings, whose selfish ambition for wide-reaching conquests often knew no bounds. Through them grew up little and great monarchies, with their bloody exploits, their slaveries and their tyrannies.

It is impossible to trace this wreckage of brotherhood, this failure to realize solidarity, as it worked its way down in history as families became tribes, tribes peoples, and peoples nations. When we reach that point where historic records become clear and trustworthy, we find men, tribes, peoples, nations, everywhere hating, fighting, plundering, enslaving and destroying one another. Not literally at every moment has this been true, or in every region. The work of destruction has often ceased from sheer exhaustion on one or both sides, until strength has been recovered for new onslaughts. It must not be forgotten that family connections and affections have al-

ways tended to restore within certain limits the sense of brotherhood and oneness. So, too, right and duty, love and beneficence, have sometimes asserted their power even between alien peoples. Nevertheless, the one feature of history, standing out above all others, has been the hating, quarreling and mutual destruction practiced by men of all ages and of all climes. This kind of history is still making itself. Within the borders of nations there has been a great change. Here civil order and peace for the most part prevail. Private war, dueling and personal fighting have almost disappeared. By the action of the collective will of the social body law has taken the place of violence. But between the nations distrust and force still have it very much their own way. To what extent a better spirit is prevailing, and may be expected further to prevail, in international affairs, and by what means the change is to be brought about, will be examined later.

III

The Causes of the Disunity

WHAT has been the cause, or causes, of this hideous historic phenomenon? There have been several causes. Lack of moral development is the general cause assigned by the evolutionary philosophy. If this means lack of moral capacity, that men did not and could not know any better, it doubtless played some part in the earlier ages, and in specific cases all the way down. But it is difficult, on any intelligent reading of authentic history, to give this cause the foremost place, or even any considerable place, in the production of the animosities and wars which have prevailed. It is impossible to believe that the wars of the nineteenth, or of any other recent century, have been waged by

peoples or rulers who had no moral conception of the iniquity of which they were guilty and no power to abstain from it. It taxes to the utmost one's power of belief to hold this view of the great contests recorded in ancient history. Had Rome and Greece no conscience and no power of self-control? Were Babylonia, Persia, the Egyptian dynasties and Carthage merely acting as irresponsible children, in their wars of conquest and of revenge? Whatever may be true of prehistoric or of early historic men, the time went by many centuries ago when wars were nothing more than the expression of the struggling forces of beings who had no moral light to guide them. The simple fact that they judged and condemned one another for injustice, for deeds of the same sort as were done by themselves, is all the proof of this position that it is necessary to bring.

Turning this evolutionary reason another way, the animalism in man is assigned as the cause of the phenomenon. Certainly,

exhibitions of greed and passion, and brutal deeds superficially resembling those of savage beasts, have abounded beyond numbering in all human history. But whoever takes the trouble to think the matter through knows that no species of animal has ever been known whose members have quarreled and fought among themselves intentionally, intelligently, systematically, and generation after generation, after the manner of men. The animalism in man, which has furnished in a way the basis for his tyrannies, robberies, animosities and destructive violence, has had connected with it something of which the animal knows nothing, — something which, if used as it might have been used, would have made the records of the past very different from what they have been. The bloody history of the world has been human history, not animal history. It has therefore been in large part, and always in some part, wicked and criminal history. It is a cheap and unworthy method of accounting for the

bloody abominations of our race to assign as their principal cause an irresponsible and uncontrollable animalism. On such a theory there can be no moral criticism of history. It is not strange, however, that such a theory is adopted. All of us at times blush to be connected with a species of being the conduct of whose members has so often been, and still is so often, diametrically opposite to all that might have been expected of them. But nothing is gained for the truth when we wipe out the responsibility of our progenitors, and of many of our contemporaries, by coolly passing them through our psychological matrix and transforming them into apes and tigers. To do this is no credit either to ourselves or to the wild beasts. Whatever the poets may say, men have never been, in historic times at least, apes and tigers, except as they have made themselves such.

Another reason, akin to the foregoing, which has been assigned for the phenomenon in question, is heredity. But this has

not been the primal cause. Men began to fight before heredity had had time to work in any wide way. They have continued to fight, in the most atrocious ways, in those countries where base inheritances are supposed to have been largely mastered by intellectual and moral training. Men have gone to battlefields direct from Christian churches and Christian homes, with generations of Christian blood in their veins, and have voluntarily joined in committing deeds about the details of which every soldier with a conscience is always silent. Heredity, by its transmission of bad instincts and dispositions, has played a serious part in the maintenance of strife and violence in the earth. But if it were the chief cause, all our efforts for the banishment of hatred and war would be perfectly hopeless. Heredity, because it is a controllable factor, is to play just as prominent a part in the creation and maintenance of universal and perpetual peace, when men decide to have it so.

Ignorance also has done much to keep alive the spirit and practice of war. Not ignorance in general; for the most intelligent nations have done most of the hard, destructive fighting; so much so that one is inclined at times grimly to think that the chief evidence of civilization in men is the highly developed disposition and capacity to cut each other's throats scientifically and gracefully, or to blow each other into fragments in the speediest and most wholesale way. The ignorance meant is that which nations show in respect to one another. Some of this, — much of it perhaps, — among the earlier and ruder peoples, whose opportunities of intercommunication were few, was unavoidable and therefore pardonable. But in later times the woeful ignorance which peoples have exhibited in reference to almost everything pertaining to other peoples, except their faults and follies, has been quite as much the effect as the cause of their mutual hatreds. This ignorance, largely voluntary and therefore crim-

inal, has been and still is one of the chief bulwarks of the war system. Hiding behind it, the citizens of one nation conjure up every imaginable ill intent on the part of those of another. Out of the consequent suspicion and fear grow armies and navies and war budgets. This criminal international ignorance is one of the worst foes with which the friends of humanity have to deal, for at its heart is found the real cause of the disunity of humanity.

Another of the potent influences which have coöperated to produce this monstrous phenomenon of history is false education. Fathers have taught their sons to hate those whom they have hated, to keep the fires of vengeance burning on the family hearthstone until offenders against their rights were overtaken and slain or beaten down and enslaved. Aggression and conquest have been taught as a duty. Mothers have sung their children to sleep with ballads of enmity and strife, and entertained them during their waking hours with

stories of battles and with toy implements of war, until the imaginations of the little ones were filled with pictures of blood and cruelty, and their young spirits charged with the frenzied desire to rush forth to fight and to slay. From their earliest years the children of the past, in home and school, have been fed on hostility and war. In this way the larger human affections have been greatly stifled and the voice of conscience often nearly silenced. When the children have grown older they have, in spite of the protests of their moral nature, voluntarily repeated the error and passed it on. The leaders and guides of peoples have been deeply guilty of this sin. Statesmen and public orators, priests and ministers of religion, historians and poets, have inculcated a love of country which meant little else than hatred and contempt for other peoples, and eagerness to injure and destroy them on the slightest provocation.

Much is said nowadays about the evil

influence of the detailed descriptions of battles found in school-books of history. This influence is bad enough, certainly, especially when these descriptions are coupled, as they so often are, with the idea, openly asserted or implied, that war is the noblest and most glorious of all callings, that there is no heroism, no manliness, like that of the soldier. But this war teaching of the school-books does not begin to equal in mischievousness the false conceptions of patriotism,[1] the exaggerated notions of the greatness and goodness of one's own country, the disregard and contempt for other lands, which are inculcated not only in the schools, but practically in all the circles of society. The unity of humanity, to any

[1] Tolstoy (*War and Peace*, and other writings) holds that patriotism is the cause of most of the existing international evils, and that these evils cannot be destroyed without the abolition of patriotism. If he had used the adjective "false" in connection with patriotism, his position would have been essentially true. A patriotism consistent with Christianity and the notion and practice of universal brotherhood is certainly possible.

great extent, cannot be attained until these false notions of patriotism cease to be held and taught, and the true relation of country to the rest of the world is properly understood and inculcated.

Back of all, running through all, and giving potency to all these causes which have coöperated in different ways to make the world a veritable field of strife and blood, has been the voluntary selfishness of men and of peoples. War, with its multiplied horrors, has not been primarily the outcome of blind forces helplessly contending with one another, but the result of self-directed purposes of beings who turned the light within them into darkness. Evidences abound in history for the truth of this position. There has always been moral perception and moral strength enough in every people with a fairly well developed civil and political organization to have kept it, if it had "minded its light," at least from the sin of aggressive wars, wars for simple vengeance and wars for glory. And these

wars constitute the bulk of the war history of the past. Of the moral responsibility of the unorganized, wandering peoples of early historic or prehistoric times it is more difficult to speak. Evidences are coming to light through recent ethnological investigations that even these peoples were not the mere fighting animals that they have been supposed to be. The most primitive peoples now existing, like the Eskimos, have, some of them, no warlike customs.[1]

The guilt of rulers and of peoples for their wars has not of course been equally distributed, for the moral capacity has not been everywhere the same. In many cases single individuals, or a few leading spirits, with commanding powers of influence, have been the guilty cause of a people's or a nation's tyrannies and aggressions, the people following them blindly and slavishly. In truth, this has been the rule in all ages and among nearly all peoples. The bloody annals of the world are, for the most part,

[1] *Encyclopedia Britannica*, article "Eskimo."

records of movements at whose centres have been powerful and unscrupulous individuals, or small groups of men. You have only to cast over in your mind the war history of any nation, as of France, Italy, Austria, Russia, Spain, or even of Great Britain, to realize how much of it has been, not the history of the people, of their life and purposes and struggles, but the history of those military tyrants, ambitious princes and headstrong statesmen who have either enslaved the people and forced them to do their will, or blinded them with false hopes of gain or glory, and so deceived them into their iniquitous service. The people have without doubt often shared the guilt of their leaders, but it is only in recent generations, since the establishment of popular government, that they have had to bear the chief burden of guilt in the case of any particular war. War has been the business of sovereigns and their minions, not of peoples. Just in proportion as peoples have become their own rulers, has war begun to disappear.

At bottom, then, to follow out the thought, war has always been a *sin* of somebody, and not simply a misfortune, not a mere freak of animalism, not a necessary phenomenon of society at a certain stage of development. Whatever other elements may have coöperated in producing it, — ignorance, heredity, false education, — the whole bloody history has been fundamentally a history of sin and wrong. Without the element of iniquitous choice, all the other causes would have operated much less powerfully, or would not have operated at all.

IV

The Development of the War System

OUT of this evil root has come the war system of the nations, which in its elaboration of armaments on land and sea has recently grown to such enormous proportions that it now constitutes the chief burden upon human society, the chief obstacle to its material and spiritual progress. In these great and ever-increasing armaments is found the largest and completest expression of the disunity of humanity. This system must have brief notice before we pass to the consideration of those efforts and influences which are working out the federation of the world and the ultimate abolition of war.

In the far past two boys or men came for some reason to hate each other, and fought

with their fists and feet; or one man in hunger, greed or envy rose up against another, smote and robbed him, the latter defending himself or afterwards retaliating. Something like that, among children or among men, was the beginning.[1] The whole war system was there in embryo, in those two hating, raving, pounding pieces of humanity. Clubs and stones were soon appropriated, in order to add to the offensive and defensive might of the fist. These made fighting more complex and more dangerous. The two men multiplied into families and clans, which envied, hated and pillaged each other; which fought, and fought again. The primitive aggressiveness and animosity grew intenser through acquired dispositions. As the race multiplied, the spirit of contention and strife

[1] The story of Cain and Abel, as given in Genesis, whatever interpretation may be put upon it, clearly indicates that in the minds of the early historic men fighting had a moral and not merely an animal origin. Cain, in the record, is under the condemnation of the conscience of his time.

deepened and widened. The stone and the club were supplemented by the sling, the spear, the battle-axe, the bow and arrow, and the sword. Men learned to fight in groups, at first as chance or instinct or interest impelled them. Then, to increase their efficiency, they began to fight under leaders and with some sort of organization and training. War at last became an art on sea and land. More brains and skill went into it, and at the same time more hate and death and woe. War became also a profession. To relieve the rest of the people, that the nation might be always ready for offense or defense, soldiers were trained and kept, whose business it was to fight. Thus grew up standing armies. War became a pastime. When there was no war at home, soldiers let themselves out, or were let out by their sovereigns, to fight for pay or to relieve the monotony of idleness.

As the system developed, watchwords and battle-cries were invented, in order to increase the unity and to strengthen the

courage of the combatants. Standards were devised and carried aloft as rallying-points, or symbols of leaders, clan, or country. In order to relieve fighting of its hideousness and to draw attention away from its agonies and groans, uniforms were put on and made resplendent, and martial music was brought into service on the parade ground and on the battlefield. Systems of tactics were thought out — everything, in fact, which intellect, sharpened and perverted by lust and hatred could do, was done, that men might be induced to go out with spirit and daring, with fury and recklessness, with skill and endurance, to beat down and destroy such of their fellow-men as might chance to be called their enemies. Victories were celebrated with noisy rejoicings, with sacrifices to the deities, with *Te Deums* to the God of mercy and love, whom men had turned into a being of hate and favoritism like themselves. Men of daring and bold deeds of blood were honored in song and story, were crowned and lionized beyond all

others. Thus war became in men's eyes the most glorious of callings, the pathway to honor and fame, and they blinded themselves to its horrors and its crimes. Pride and vanity united with lust, greed and revenge, to clothe the bloody monster in the trappings of heaven. God became the god of armies, a regular blood-wading Mars, appealed to by all combatants to give his favor to their side. The battlefield grew in honor as the chief school of the so-called manly virtues. Women became possessed of the spirit of war, and nursed their boys at the breast of aggression and revenge, of pride and pomp and glory, and took only soldiers, if they could get them, as husbands for their daughters.

As the war system[1] developed and made all peoples its slaves, every discovery of science, every invention adding to human

[1] Charles Sumner, *The True Grandeur of Nations* and *The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations.* Rev. Reuen Thomas, D. D., *The War System, its History, Tendency and Character in the Light of Civilization and Religion.*

power, was immediately turned into an instrument of conquest, of revenge, of destruction and death. Sovereigns and peoples, in this emulation of brute force as the instrument of passion, greed and violence, failing to find sufficient mercenary or voluntary force to outdo their neighbors, resorted to forced levies and conscriptions, and, to meet the ever-growing demands for money, adopted the ruinous and irrational expedient of war loans, and took to mortgaging the future. Business of every kind, home life, civic interests, education, religion even, had to fall down helpless at the feet of the war-god. Differences, small and great, between sovereigns were submitted to the blind and senseless arbitrament of the sword. Might became right, and justice between peoples wandered outcast and homeless. Honor and patriotism — the former merely a euphemism for excessive and irritable self-esteem personal and national, the latter a blind worship of self under the impersonal guise of country — became the criteria of duty.

In all these ways the barbarous war system has grown and grown until it stands to-day, in appalling magnitude, fortified to heaven in the very heart of civilization. There is no tyranny[1] of our time like that which it exercises; no blinding of conscience and paralysis of will greater than that which it produces. Year after year the armies grow and the fleets expand. Year after year the war debts rise and the screw of taxation is turned mercilessly down another thread. Science is incessantly tortured in the hope of wringing from her some new death-dealing instrument, which will give one nation advantage over others. It is a race of death, spurred on by fear and envy, in which every nation seems determined to outstrip others even at the expense of plunging headlong into the bottomless pit of exhaustion and ruin. Over four millions of soldiers under arms; seventeen

[1] Gladstone said, in a letter to a committee of the Friends in Lancashire, April 16, 1889: "Militarism is the most conspicuous tyrant of the age."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

or eighteen millions more trained in the last tactics of death; a conscriptive system holding all Europe in the grasp of its enslaving hand, turning every able-bodied man into a fighting machine, and effacing, for a portion of every citizen's life, the last vestige of liberty of conscience; young men by millions taken from home, from education, from business, and passed through the hardening, demoralizing influences of camp and barracks, thus polluting at its very sources the life of the next generation; a thousand war vessels prowling about the seas; one third of the annual revenues spent on preparations for war, and another third on wars already fought; national debts grown to frightful proportions (thirty thousand millions of dollars in the aggregate), and still growing; new implements of death — magazine guns, rapid-fire guns, dynamite guns — daily turned out, new warships launched, new fortifications erected and manned; the nations in perpetual jealousy, hatred and fear, bound hand and foot by suspicion, un-

able to unite in the simplest deeds of right and justice, — such is the amazing phenomenon presented by so-called Christendom to-day![1] Talk of federation, under these circumstances, would seem, at first thought, to be fitting only for an asylum for the hopelessly insane.

The war system has so far resisted every effort to check its growth. In fact, no direct effort to check it has ever been made until recently, and almost none by the governments themselves. On the contrary, they have zealously and systematically promoted it, and the people have remained so blinded by its terrible magnificence, and so bewildered by its antiquity and supposed necessity, that they have weakly and fawningly thrown themselves under its Juggernaut wheels and allowed themselves to be crushed by millions. Of late years, the

[1] The annual editions of the *Statesman's Year-Book*, Hazell's *Annual* and Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* may be consulted for the figures of the growth of militarism in recent years.

heads of the governments, at Christmas time, have indulged in pious effusions about peace, but at the same time they have carefully filled their powder magazines a little fuller, recommended the construction of new battleships, and added new regiments to their armies. The war system is steadily spreading its baleful influences throughout the world.[1] The nations of the Orient, just emerging from their former errors and superstitions, are, under the influence of the Western nations, turning their thought and their revenues to the creation of armies and fleets rather than to the development of the arts of civil life. This is particularly true of Japan, the progressive nation of the East, which, since the close of her war with China, has surprised and frightened the Western nations by the magnitude and rapidity of her naval extension. Our own country, abandoning its historic policy,

[1] In his recently published book, *The Wonderful Century*, chap. xix., Alfred Russel Wallace characterizes militarism as "the curse of civilization."

is now in the full tide of naval construction, in time of peace, and is beginning, only half consciously as yet, but none the less really, to vie with the nations of Europe for naval supremacy.

There are people enough who think that this emulous expansion of militarism is all wrong; private citizens and public men enough who deplore the existence of "bloated armaments" and the crushing burden of war taxes; friends of peace enough in all countries who condemn as iniquitous the whole system in general; governments enough which upbraid all other governments for going forward a single step in the mad race toward what all see will be irretrievable ruin. But here the protest, for the most part, stops. All is wrong in general, but everybody in particular is right — in his own eyes. There is scarcely a man to say that *his* country ought at once to withdraw from the wicked rivalry. There are probably not a hundred influential men in the United States who

will declare unequivocally that our own country ought not to build another warship; that to continue the building up of our navy is both perilous and unworthy of our national character. There are few public men at Washington, so far as I know, who will dare to say this, or even venture to think it. In the House of Commons in 1896, where three years before a unanimous vote in favor of arbitration had been given,[1] the friends of military retrenchment were able to muster barely thirty votes against an increase in the naval budget, and their effort found little apparent sympathy in the nation at large. On the European continent, except possibly in Italy, any public man in one of the great powers would be instantly and almost universally declared a traitor, who dared to hint that his country should stop trying to

[1] The Cremer resolution, favoring a treaty of arbitration with the United States, was passed by the House of Commons, *without a division*, on the 16th of June, 1893.

keep pace with other countries in military extension and begin single-handed the work of disarmament. The plea of necessity — the sinner's favorite plea — is everywhere made: Others do so; therefore we must do so until they do otherwise. So the barbarous system continues its tyrannous hold upon the nations. The cup of its iniquity is not yet full, it seems.

How is this gigantic, growing evil to be arrested and gotten out of the way? Federation and peace cannot make much visible progress while the governments, with the consent and encouragement of the people, make it their chief business to cultivate the arts of estrangement and war. The largest and most serious question which can be asked to-day is, How much farther is the militarism of the civilized world to go? Is the United States so to fall under its dominion as to build up a great fleet of five hundred war vessels, make all its seaboard cities like mediæval castles, and militarize its people by a system of forced

instruction in the tactics of war? Are China and Japan to climb to the war-level — perhaps it would be more true to say descend to the war-level — of England, France, Germany and Russia? Are the nations of South and of Central America, and those just beginning to bud on the Dark Continent, to follow in the same path, until the "armed camp" of Europe becomes, fifty years hence, the armed camp of the world?

There is no end to the questions to which the dreadful situation gives rise. Is all this militarism to continue developing until the nations become so virtuous as all at once to join in simultaneous and complete or gradual disarmament? Or until the tension becomes so great as to result in a frightful cataclysm which will overwhelm the world? Or until the financial burden grows so heavy as to force the governments to stop from sheer exhaustion, or the people to rise up in revolt against the crushing slavery and demand a new order

of administration? Is disarmament, commencing, nobody knows how, as the result of the gradual prevalence of pacific methods of settling international disputes, to come about by a process of gradual decay? Or is some nation, under the inspiration of great Christian ideas, aroused by some grand God-sent man or men, or pushed forward by a deep spirit of right moving in its masses, to take the initiative, begin disarmament alone, throwing itself for protection on God and the manhood of the world, and thus on the high ground of love and duty lead the nations to "beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks"?

All these are serious questions. No thoughtful mind can face the dreadful reality of the growing tyranny of militarism, as it now exists, without asking some or all of them. Which of them, how many of them, shall be answered in the affirmative? Perhaps we shall be better able, so far as able at all, to choose among them and find

answers which shall have at least a working value, after we have examined the origin and growth of the international peace movement, — a movement which has already become so strong as to put the war system considerably on the defensive, which betokens its ultimate if not speedy overthrow and the final enthronement in the world of universal and permanent coöperation and peace.

NOTE. The situation in respect to the growth of armaments has remained to the present time (1907) much as it was when this chapter was first published, eight years ago. Naval development particularly has gone on with even accelerated speed. The naval expenses of both the United States and Great Britain have more than doubled in that time. Germany, France, and Japan have been only a little behind. But there has recently appeared, among public men in several countries, a remarkable change of attitude on the subject of armaments, the nature and extent of which will be set forth in the final chapter of this book.

V

The Influence of Christianity in restoring the Federative Principle

THE whole movement for the abolition of war, for the establishment of peaceful relations between men, and for the ultimate federation of all the interests of human society, began with the appearance of Christianity. The movement has, of course, a natural basis in the constitution of humanity, as heretofore stated. There are many natural forces at work in it, and these are becoming more powerful every year; but their activity and efficiency are due, for the most part, to the quickening and liberating influence which Christianity has had upon them. Prior to the advent of Christ the elements of division and disintegration, heretofore described, rendered the natural peace forces nearly

powerless, and outside of the circle of his influence they still hold practically undisputed mastery. Whatever gains were made at particular times and places in the way of concord were soon lost in the general chaos of greed, hate, violence and disorder. The influence of Christianity in setting free the peace forces of human nature and human society, and starting them into activity, has been slow and not very uniform; but it has been incessant and sure, and some of the first ripe fruit of it is just now being gathered.

This influence has been exerted through a Person, a Book and a Society. The Founder of Christianity was a perfect peacemaker. He was not directly an anti-war prince. He said and did little directly about the practice of war as it existed everywhere about him. He seems to have ignored it. His work was positive and constructive. He was the Prince of Peace, unarmed and incapable of bearing the arms of worldly warfare. All the forces which

make for peace were always active in him; those which produce war found no place in his being. His speech and conduct reveal no traces of them. The sword which he came to send [1] was the sword of truth and love, which was to be drawn against all the institutions of selfish hate, in the family, in the state and in the world. The strife that he set going was that in which men conquer by patient loyalty to truth and by cheerfully allowing themselves to be killed for its sake; not that in which men draw the steel blade of violence to spill each other's blood.

Jesus Christ loved men. That was his life, his supreme motive, his only passion. He went about doing them good, in spirit and in body. There was nothing he would not do to help men; but he never did harm to any one. He lifted not a finger of violence in self-defense or in defense of others. It is impossible to conceive of him as having armed himself against his fellow-men

[1] Matthew x. 34. Compare Luke xii. 49 ff.

for any purpose whatever, or to have smitten one in the interests of another. If he used force at all, it stopped short of being hurtful.[1] Fearless, faithful to truth, unmasking unreality, but tender, patient, forgiving, harmless, loving and helpful even

[1] Dr. Lyman Abbott, in *Christianity and Social Problems*, chap. ix., adduces Christ's example in the purification of the temple, and in the garden when the soldiers of the guard fell backward to the ground, as a proof that Jesus approved of the deadly use of force in the defense of others. At least, that appears to be his conclusion, though he does not say it in so many words. It is difficult to see how the power which Jesus exercised on those two occasions is to be classed as physical force, as we use the term. It was certainly not the whip of small (straw) cords which induced any one to leave the temple. If an argument for the use of force in a punitive way is to be based on these incidents, then Christ's restraint in its employment on both occasions would certainly go to show that he meant that its use should always stop short of being deadly or really harmful. If "love may use force," as Dr. Abbott contends, it must use it in such a way as to manifest itself as "love" towards both the parties with whom it is dealing, and not towards one alone. The whip of small cords, according to recent translations, was used only to drive out the animals.

unto death, he gave himself in total sacrifice, seeking nothing in return, that he might create in men a spirit like his own, and thus unite them to God, and to one another in a kingdom of love and mutual beneficence. This great loving, peace-making Person, through the record left of him, has been speaking and acting in all the generations since, as no other person has done, as all other persons combined have not done. Thought and speech for nineteen centuries have been unable to get away from him; they are less able to get away from him to-day than ever before. His character and example, wherever known, have appealed powerfully to men's spirits and tended to create, and actually created in greater or less degree, lives and dispositions like his own. Who can estimate the cumulative power of such a personality on individuals, on society, on institutions?

As with the Person, so with the Book. The New Testament[1] is the Book of

[1] The New Testament, not the Bible as a whole, is

Peace. It says little about war as an institution. But the spirit of selfishness, envy, hate, retaliation and vengeance, out of which war springs, is everywhere reprobated on its pages. It exalts love to the supremest place among the virtues. It makes goodwill the heart of righteousness. Its great thesis is the Fatherhood and love of God manifested in a practical way in Jesus Christ. Love to God and love to man, self-sacrifice for others, forgiveness of injuries, non-resistance of evil with evil, overcoming evil with good, brotherly fellowship and peace, are the foremost of its practical teachings. On these it always insists; the opposites of these it always condemns. The New Testament is to-day, unimportant particulars aside, the same book as when in collected form it was first read to the churches in the second and third

the final standard as to Christian teaching on this subject. Those who appeal to the Old Testament to support war abandon Christian grounds. See Matthew v. 38 ff.

centuries. It has been the same in every period of Christian history. Men have turned its God and Saviour into curious likenesses of themselves, misinterpreted its doctrines, made strange travesties of its practical teachings, or omitted entirely the most essential of them. But in spite of these perversions and misinterptetations, its pages of love, goodwill and peace, ever the same, read and re-read century after century, have spoken in their natural simplicity direct to multitudes of hearts. It has been better than the best of its interpreters, and good in spite of the worst. It has thus gradually turned men's ideas into new lines, and given the world an increasingly clear conception of the true law of individual and social life, of the true relations of the societies of men, as well as of individuals, one to another.

These great principles of goodwill, mutual service and peace, taught by Christ, transmitted in the New Testament, and operating, now strongly, now feebly, in

the society which he formed, have gradually permeated the life of peoples and nations, and transformed their habits of thought, their morals, customs, laws and political institutions.[1] The Christian Society, speaking of it in the large, though often far from ideal, and frequently in parts of it Christian in almost nothing but name, has been instrumental in working out the conditions of universal and lasting federation and peace chiefly through the new and profounder idea, and the better example, of kinship which it has presented. The kinship lying at the basis of Christian civilization, as its creative principle, is not the kinship of the *family*, under earthly parenthood, but the kinship of *man*, in the Fatherhood of God.[2] The kinship of the family, unless regenerated and directed by something beyond itself, tends naturally to exclusiveness, clannishness and social division. At best, the range of its cultivation of

[1] Charles Loring Brace, *Gesta Christi.*

[2] Benjamin Kidd, *Social Evolution*, chap. vii.

the social affections is narrow. The kinship of man in the Fatherhood of God, when truly realized, tends naturally to universal fellowship, to social union, and thus to liberty and equal rights. It recognizes no distinction of highborn and lowborn. It declares every man the brother of every other man. It ignores all lines of descent and all boundaries of nationality. It drives out hate and strips off the weapons with which selfishness had armed itself. It puts on a whole armor of goodwill and loving service.

This great Christian principle of the divine kinship of men has gone with, or rather carried, the Christian Society into all the world, across all national boundaries, over all the barriers created by caste. It has worked slowly and irregularly, it is true, and against great obstacles from within the Society and from without, but its influence on the whole has been enormous. It has caused multitudes of men in every age since the time of Christ to live together in

mutual helpfulness and peace, and often to settle their disputes, if any arose, by referring them to the impartial judgment of their friends.[1] It has created a new sense of human worth and human dignity. It has undermined tyranny and slavery, not wholly yet, but in a very marked degree. It has developed democracy in government. It has set free the impulses to travel and to trade, and thus created the world-wide commercial interchanges of our day, — a system as absolutely dependent on brotherly coöperation and trust, for its normal growth and development, as religion itself. It has changed the whole notion of nationality from its former meaning of an enforced union under kingly authority, and has rebuilt it, or is fast rebuilding it, upon the principles of mutual interest and the consent of the governed. It has led gradually to the general substitution of law for violence in the adjustment of personal misunderstandings within national limits.

[1] *Gesta Christi*, chaps. viii., xii., xiii., xiv., xxvii.

It has created a system of international law, and is slowly improving it. Liberty, equality, fraternity, whose names the French revolutionists wrote with such terrible emphasis on the façades of all the public buildings of Paris, are great conceptions, — Christian, human. But fraternity is first, not last. Brotherhood is the ground principle of all our Christian civilization. Without the sense of brotherhood love would be impossible, and without this, expressing itself in manifold practical forms, the whole structure of our modern social organism, weak enough as it is, would collapse into the ancient discord, and war, which is the outward expression of selfishness and hate, would be eternal.

It is needless to say that this principle of the divine kinship of men, set forth and exemplified by Christ, taught with such directness and force in the New Testament, and operative with growing power, through the Christian Society, in the reconstruction of all human institutions, is the root from

which has sprung the modern peace movement, — the movement for the abolition of war, and for the federation and friendly coöperation of all the nations of the earth.

VI

War Ethically Wrong

THE movement for the abolition of war, as a distinctive phase of humane reform, has two main grounds. One of these is the conception that war *per se* is always ethically wrong; the other, that it is anti-federative, or anti-social, and therefore opposed to all the great interests of human society. According to the first of these conceptions, war is condemned because it violates not only the great law of love set forth by the Founder of Christianity, but as well every principle of the moral law; because it settles no question on the basis of right; because it is a system having no element of humanity in it; because it originates in and is supported by selfishness, hate and revenge; because its deeds are always wicked and

inhuman ; because it calls out all the baser passions, is prolific of vice and crime and produces general social demoralization. From this point of view, war is held always to be unlawful as a means either of promoting good or of defense against evil, a wicked and inhuman instrument, which no group of enlightened human beings can ever innocently use against another. This view does not maintain that no good result has ever come from any war ; it does maintain that a good end does not justify the use of an essentially evil means, even though the desired end may be reached thereby, but that the result should be brought about by a different means. The view likewise does not maintain that war has never been relatively right for some peoples in some ages of the world ; it does maintain that, in the nature of things, from the constitution of men and their relations to God and to one another, it is fundamentally and everlastingly wrong, and that those who have come to a knowledge of its

intrinsic character can never have anything to do with it, and are under the supremest obligation not only to abstain from all war themselves, but to do all in their power to bring others to see it in the same light and treat it in the same way.[1]

Historically, the peace movement, in its modern organized form, originated in this conception. The conception is as old as Christianity, and operated in the general work of Christianization long before any distinctive peace movement was thought of. No sooner had Christian men looked at the system of war from the standpoint of the character, example and teachings of Jesus and of the whole spirit of the gospel,

[1] For an exposition of this view, consult the *Essays on Morality*, by Jonathan Dymond; the *Manual of Peace*, by Thomas C. Upham; *The Early Christians and War*, by Thomas Clarkson; *Observations on the Distinguishing Views and Practices of the Friends* (chap. xii.), by J. J. Gurney; the *Speeches and Addresses* of John Bright; *Defensive War*, by Henry Richard. Consult also the writings of Count Leo Tolstoy, who is the most distinguished living advocate of the principle of the entire unlawfulness of war.

than the utter incompatibility of the two at once dawned on them. This was the conception and practice of the early Christians, as a whole, for more than a hundred years.[1] It was the conception of many of the leading exponents of Christianity during the second and third centuries, before the great apostasy set heavily in. Later, it was the conception of Wyclif,[2] the first light of the Reformation and of a restored primitive Christianity. It was the conception, in the seventeenth century, of George Fox[3] and William Penn, in whom and in the society formed by whom the Reformation found for a brief period its fullest ideal expression.

When the peace movement entered upon its organized existence in the early part of last century, as a definite effort to do away with war, this conception lay at the bottom

[1] J. Bevan Braithwaite, *The Early Christians and War*, in London Peace Congress Report.

[2] Robert Vaughan, *Life of Wyclif*, vol. ii. chap. vii.

[3] *Journal*, in various passages.

of the undertaking.[1] The early peace societies organized in this country from 1815 to 1828 were founded, every one of them, by men whose minds and consciences had gone to the bottom of the iniquity of war and discarded it in every shape.[2] The London Peace Society, founded in 1816, had the same basis. For fifty years the chief supporters of the propaganda were, not wholly but mostly, "peace-at-any-price" men, as they have been contemptuously but falsely called. William Allen, Thomas Clarkson, Jonathan Dymond, Joseph John Gurney, Richard Cobden, Joseph Sturge, John Bright, Henry Richard, and their faithful co-workers in Parliament and out of it; Noah Worcester, whose "Solemn Review" aroused the churches of two nations; William Ladd, the matchless Apostle

[1] David L. Dodge, *The Mediator's Kingdom not of This World.* Noah Worcester, *Solemn Review.*

[2] For an account of the organization of the first peace societies, see papers by Dr. W. Evans Darby, W. C. Braithwaite, Esq., and Benjamin F. Trueblood, in the Report of the Chicago Peace Congress of 1893.

of Peace and first general organizer of the work,[1] whose treatise on "A Congress and Court of Nations," sixty years ago, left little to be said on the subject; Adin Ballou,[2] the distinguished founder of this lectureship, for many years president of the New England Non-Resistant Society; Thomas C. Upham,[3] William Lloyd Garrison,[4] John G. Whittier,[5] Elihu Burritt,[6] — all these were men who believed war to be essentially sinful and never justifiable, a vast system of iniquity to be dug up by the roots and cast out of human society. These were the great prophets to whom the word of the Lord came in the wilderness, whose inspired utterances aroused the sleeping conscience of the world. Others, of course,

[1] See *Memoir of William Ladd, the Apostle of Peace*, by John Hemmenway.

[2] Consult the *Autobiography of Adin Ballou*, edited by William S. Heywood.

[3] *The Manual of Peace.*

[4] Consult the *Life of Garrison*, by his Sons.

[5] See various poems on Peace and Disarmament.

[6] *Life and Labors of Elihu Burritt.*

who did not take this radical view, for example, Dr. Channing,[1] Charles Sumner,[2] Judge William Jay,[3] Dr. Peabody,[4] became hearty supporters of the cause and did it service of a very high order. But they did not originate it. The men who brought the movement forth, who organized the first societies, and afterwards the first international congresses,[5] who furnished the means, who cherished the cause through vituperation and ridicule into the respect which it has at last won, were peace-at-any-price men, or rather, as they should always be called, peace-on-principle men. The movement would not have started when it did, and not even yet possibly, but for the undimmed consciences, the courage and

[1] For Channing's views, see essays on War, in his collected works.

[2] *The True Grandeur of Nations.*

[3] *Review of the War with Mexico.*

[4] *Address before the American Peace Society.*

[5] See Report of the Peace Congresses of Brussels, Paris, Frankfort, London and Edinburgh, 1848–1853, published in one volume, by the London Peace Society.

self-sacrificing devotion, of these princes of peace.

Not much is heard nowadays of this class of peace men, except in the way of apology or derogation. I have recently heard it asserted at an important peace conference that the genus is about extinct; that the position has been found to be untenable and has been abandoned. Many of those who are seeking earnestly to promote the principle and practice of arbitration are careful to say that they are not peace-at-any-price men. They even go out of their way to say a good word for war under certain exigencies. Their consciences are nearer to the radical peace view than they are willing to admit, but they feel bound to keep up a sort of consistency with their past, with the fighting idea of "patriotism" and of "honor," and with an old historic notion about war, from which they are not quite strong enough and brave enough to break away.

My firm and mature conviction, formed

on religious, moral and historic grounds, is that this conception of the entire unlawfulness of war, which has been held by so many Christian leaders in the past and which created the peace movement, is in no remote future inevitably to become universal among good men. Its adherents are not decreasing. They are more numerous throughout Christendom to-day than ever before. Witness the hundred thousand Stundists in Russia, many of whom sympathize strongly with the opinions of Count Tolstoy; the twenty thousand Doukhobortsi[1] in the Russian Caucasus; the thirty thousand Nazarenes in southern Hungary; the Friends, Mennonites and Moravians, who still, in many parts of the world, maintain their ancient profession; the increasing number of individuals in all the

[1] The Doukhobortsi, for their refusal to bear arms, have recently been subjected to persecutions worthy of the most barbarous times. *Christian Martyrdom in Russia*, recently published by the Brotherhood Publishing Co., Paternoster Square, London, contains an account of their persecutions and exile.

denominations who will no longer make any apology for war; the many individuals in continental Europe who refuse to do military service of any kind.[1]

It is true, war is not attacked on this ground so exclusively as formerly. The crusade against it has become so widespread and powerful, and is pushed forward on so many strong grounds,—rational, humanitarian, social, economic,—that it seems unnecessary to put this fundamental ethical view forward so constantly as formerly. Most of those who hold it, and are ready to defend it on all proper occasions, are only too glad to join with other true

[1] Van der Ver, of Holland, whose recent heroic refusal to do military service Tolstoy has preserved for all time, is only one of an increasing body of young men in Europe whose example would be much more contagious than it is if their conduct were not so carefully kept by the authorities from the knowledge of the public. One of the leading lawyers of Brussels, a Belgian senator, told the writer in 1894 that what is needed more than anything else in Europe to-day, to break down the tyranny of militarism, is a large body of men who will refuse to do military service of any kind.

friends of the cause, on common grounds, and to coöperate with them in the practical effort now being made to establish permanent peaceful methods of settling all disputes. War will be abolished on these common grounds rather than on the perfect ethical one, except so far as that mingles with the others and gives them vitality and persistence, as it does and always will do; just as the radical, immediate emancipation principle was always the backbone of the anti-slavery movement. But when the horrible system of human butchery shall have been abolished, then all good men will be "peace-at-any-price" men, just as all good men are now anti-slavery men; and they will wonder then that any man of conscience could ever have been anything else. As Victor Hugo prophesied at the opening of the peace congress at Paris, in 1849, people will then look upon a cannon in a museum as we now look upon an instrument of torture, with amazement that such a thing could ever have been. The "peace-

at-any-price" men will then have their complete vindication at the bar of a thoroughly christianized and enlightened public conscience. The principle out of which their opposition to war springs is the seed-principle of the whole federative movement of human society, and no one can understand the spirit and history of this movement who does not take into account the place which these men have held in it. Some of the radical advocates of peace hold that no effective opposition to war can be made by those who do not hold and practice this principle. In this, it seems to me, they are mistaken, as the discussion will presently show.

VII

War Anti-Federative

THE other leading ground on which the crusade against war is carried on is that it is anti-federative. War is now seen by all sensible men to be a huge load on the constructive forces of society, an immeasurable obstacle to the free play of the federative elements in human nature. It reduces national prosperity to a minimum, not only by wasting men, labor, money, material, intellectual activity, sentiment and moral force at home, but likewise by keeping peoples apart and preventing the profitable interaction of those federative forces, and the mutual use of those special resources of different lands, on which the moral development and common weal of the world so much depend. Under the long action of Christianity and

of the natural forces which Christianity has brought more and more into healthful activity, the federative tendencies have become powerfully operative in our modern society, especially between individuals and contiguous communities, but also between nations. Witness the broad range of religious and philanthropic work, the reformatory movements, the commercial and industrial enterprises, in a word, the multitude of humane as well as profit-seeking enterprises of our day, which pay little regard to national boundaries. For this reason, war is coming to be held intolerable, and the spirit out of which it springs irrational and utterly stupid. It not only wastes and destroys the accumulations of the past; it checks and obstructs, and often almost entirely paralyzes all federative, constructive work, without which families and communities are so helpless in these days, from almost every point of view. The peace movement has therefore drawn into it, or rather had forced into it, large numbers of

men who are not yet ready to grant that war as an instrument is always morally unlawful. The great concern now is to get rid of it in the speediest way, not to prove it in every case morally wrong. By most thoughtful men, except a few whose brains are still strangely streaked with protoplasm, — men who prate about the glory of war, its inculcation of the manly virtues, its necessity to prevent civilization from decaying, — it is considered in all ordinary cases sufficiently immoral and always dreadful enough to enlist their heartiest sympathy and coöperation in every feasible effort to banish it from the world.

Some of our radical peace men have wondered at the sudden influx of men of this description — statesmen, jurists, scholars, literary men, bankers, stock exchangers, capitalists, workingmen, socialists, etc. — into the ranks of the peace forces. They have hastily inferred that the movement is getting on to lower ground. But this is only apparently so. The ground, though

broader, is really the same, — the incompatibility, that is, of war with the federative nature of men, and therefore with all the great interests of mankind. If war wrought no damage to the moral and material welfare of the race, no opposition to it would ever have been made. The protest of the early peace men against war, as essentially and always immoral, grew really out of the positive conception that men and nations are so constituted that they ought to love one another; that this is the law of their being; that mutual service and coöperation are obligatory, because the different social units and groups are naturally members one of another, and cannot reach their proper development, comfort and happiness in any other way.

The protest would have been true, possibly, if there existed no federative nature in men. Aggression and revenge, fighting and mutual destruction, would be wrong if individuals and nations had absolutely no power of mutual service. But the protest would

never have been made, or even thought of, or, if made, would have seemed shadowy and irrelevant, but for the positive demand in the constitution of humanity for good-will, coöperation and solidarity. Made from the standpoint of these principles, which were urged with great force by the early opponents of war,[1] the protest gradually recommended itself as essentially sound, and has had a powerful influence in awakening the already stirring conscience of the civilized world, not only to the cruelty and inhumanity of war, but also to its absurdity and entire needlessness. On the ground of these federative principles and the destructive effect of war and war preparations upon the solidarity of human interests, many have joined the peace movement who have not been able to follow the "peace-at-any-price" men to the logical conclusion of the principles. This is the explanation of the sudden development which the movement against war has recently shown throughout

[1] Noah Worcester, *The Friend of Peace*, 1815–1827.

the civilized world. The movement is not getting on to lower ground. It is on the same ground, essentially, and is gradually drawing into it all those in whom the Christian progress of the world has created a sincere and often large love for human good, for practical human brotherhood. The movement is therefore immensely stronger, because of the number of its adherents, and the power which it thereby possesses to secure practical results in legislation, than it was when it had no friends except the radical ones, who spent their time largely in depicting the horrors and revolting cruelties of the battlefield, and in collating and expounding texts of the New Testament to prove their one thesis, that war, defensive as well as offensive, is always unlawful. The federative tendencies and beliefs of the larger number of men of what are sometimes called half-and-half principles, who have in recent years given their support to peaceful methods of settling disputes, have made possible the ex-

cellent results which have been attained both in the field of international arbitration and in that of industrial arbitration. All of the statesmen[1] who have done so much the past century in securing the adjustment of international disputes by peaceful methods have been men who would not have hesitated, under given circumstances, to go to war. How much more might have been done, if these men had all been radical peace men, it is useless to try to conjecture. But one thing is certain: without their cordial belief in arbitration and the spirit out of which it springs, nothing at all would yet have been accomplished in a practical way.

I am not arguing that these men are nearer right than the radical peace men, but only that the movement has become immensely stronger since so many of them

[1] Jay, Jefferson, Pinkney, Webster, Grant, Gladstone, Sumner, Fish, Schenck, Earl Grey, Sir S. H. Northcote, Sir E. Thornton, Rose, Count Sclopis, Staempfli, Blaine, Pauncefote, Gresham, Olney, Foster, and others.

have interested themselves in it, and that the ground of their support is, as far as it goes, true peace ground. The old thesis I believe to be profoundly right. Its constant maintenance was absolutely necessary in its time. Men's minds were so stupefied by false ideas about the glory and the necessity of war that only the most intense radicalism and realism of treatment could arouse them. Only radical men would have ventured into the halls of legislation, in the early days, with memorials to urge the claims of peaceful methods in composing international troubles. The maintenance of the thesis is still necessary as an essential part, nay, rather, the very centre and core, of the peace movement. There are times when radical peace men are the only peace men left, all others being carried away by the spirit of war. In Russia, where this thesis is maintained with so much vigor and freshness by Tolstoy, supported by multitudes of peasants throughout the empire, the peace propaganda cannot yet take on

any other form. The great count is tolerated only because it is known by the state authorities that he will not take up arms, and that he counsels others not to take up arms, against the government. Thus he and his followers are doing for Russia what men of no other principles could do. It is felt by a number of the friends of peace in Europe that the yoke of European militarism can never be broken until there arise in the midst of it a body of men who will refuse, for conscience' sake, to do military service in any form.

But, after all, the real strength of the peace movement does not lie in the protest against war and its desolations, cruelties and horrors. It lies in the *protest for concord*, and its utilities and glories. The former is only a part of the latter. Men can never be brought to see the wickedness of violence until they see the true nature of peace on its positive side, the moral grandeur of love, the individual and social worth of cordial fellowship, the immense economic

and happiness value of wide-reaching industrial and commercial coöperation, the incalculable benefits, the dignity and honorableness of international trust and concord. Men who do not see these will, as a rule, never see anything wrong in war. When they see these, you will not need to portray to them the moral hideousness of war. For war and war preparations are nothing but the outward manifestation of the spirit of exclusiveness, hate, greed and aggression on the part of nations. When this spirit goes out of men, war and war preparations go out of them. So long as this spirit remains, it is idle to talk of disarmament. You can do something, especially among thinking Christian men, to create a new feeling about war by holding it up to the shafts of a pitiless moral analysis, but you can do much more among the masses of men, to whom fine ethical conceptions do not so much appeal, by showing that war is the deadly enemy of all those economic and social interchanges on

which the prosperity, the happiness and the moral welfare of peoples of all lands now so largely depend. This is the ground on which much of the most effective peace work is now being done. Still more can be done by setting in movement, or by aiding in developing, all sorts of healthy international coöperation.

VIII

The New World Society

THE main ground of hope at the present time for the speedy abolition of war is, not some theoretical guess as to what the federative forces ought to do or may do, but their actually existing results in the social, economic and political structure of the world, constituting a world society of very marked development. This world society may be traced in many directions. Christian missions, in an organized and permanent form unknown till the past century, now have their growing centres of religious and educational activity in every quarter of the globe,[1] and Christ's doctrine of the brotherhood of men in the Father-

[1] F. Max Müller, *Lecture on Missions.* Theodore Christlieb, *Protestant Foreign Missions.* James S. Dennis, *Christian Missions and Social Progress.*

hood of God was never set forth with so much simplicity, directness, freedom from prejudice, and practical efficiency as in the present generation.

Following these missions and in part created by them, commerce has grown and spread until it has become world-wide. It has woven its network of intercourse, and planted the homes of its merchants and carriers on the shores of all the continents and of the important islands of the sea, and pushed itself into the heart of the most unknown inlands. It has discovered new resources, opened up new occupations, taught workingmen to go from one end of the earth to the other. It has created a great credit system, which is fast uniting all the large cities of the world and many smaller ones together in a community of interest.

Labor has not only its national, but also its international associations, which are bringing the millions of laboring people in many lands into ever closer union and sympathy, and the working classes have already

learned that they have a higher mission than to be the mere tools of capital or of selfish and greedy monarchs. There is no federative force more powerful than that of labor, and it is binding society together at the very bottom.

International travel, not for religious and commercial purposes only, but also for intellectual, scientific and social purposes, has been rendered swift and easy by the inventions which have led to the formation of the great steamship lines and the transcontinental railways. The volume of travel merely for sight-seeing and pleasure, for rest and recuperation, has become so immense that for three months in each year it seems as if the whole civilized world were in migration.[1]

This internationalization of religion, of business, of society, of science, etc., by ac-

[1] During the recent war with Spain many of the steamship lines between the United States and Europe found their business cut down nearly fifty per cent. What this means in checking the natural flow of money throughout the world is easily imagined.

quainting peoples with one another, is removing many prejudices, and teaching men the numerous ways in which those remotest from one another may contribute to one another's prosperity and happiness. The telegraph, the cable and the associated press have put all parts of this complex world structure into almost instant contact with one another, so that a disturbance in one part is at once felt everywhere else. This immense network of interests, all antagonistic to war, is constantly being woven thicker and firmer; the result of it will be, in the near future, that the world society, purely in self-defense, will banish war from its midst, as a necessary condition of the permanence of the federation and union of interests in which each unit finds its life and well-being. Formerly, when the nations traded little with each other, when their citizens sojourned little abroad, when international communication was slow and difficult,[1] when property was in the hands of

[1] It was several days before the knowledge of the

a few lords, and the people were menials and knew little of the real comforts and blessings of life, two nations might fight and desolate each other, for a series of years even, and the rest of the nations feel it little or care little about it, except from the military standpoint of the rulers, who were glad oftener than not, because of the opportunity for exploits which the wars of neighboring states opened to them. In our time, a war between two nations is, in its effects at least, a war everywhere. Every nation's industry and commerce are crippled; every nation's credit disturbed; every nation's citizens imperiled; every nation's happiness and comfort interfered with.

In this complex state of international society, and because of the awful destructiveness of modern implements of warfare, it is inevitable that there should soon be some concert of the nations to reduce war, when it occurs, to the briefest possible period, to

battle of Waterloo, in 1815, got across the Channel and reached London.

the narrowest limits, and ultimately to prevent it entirely. This concert is likely to be for a time in part a concert of force, exerting itself in the neutralization [1] of small countries, in the protection of commerce on the high seas, and in preventing any nation from breaking the peace. But the concert of force, which from its very nature can be participated in by only a few great powers, contains in it so many elements of danger, and is, from the very selfishness out of which it springs, so liable to break down at the critical moment, as it did in the case of the recent Armenian massacres, that the conscience of the world will not be satisfied very long with such an arrangement. The world society must have something of a higher order, a moral concert founded in mutual beneficence and trust. The concert of force, while it grows, and so long as it lasts, is likely, too, to be limited to those nations where militarism has come up from

[1] T. K. Arnoldson, *Pax Mundi*, chapter on "Neutrality."

the past, and will probably never be entered into by a nation of the truly modern spirit like the United States. At least, it is to be hoped that it will not. The concert which is to end war, which is even now working itself out on a grand scale in the movements of the world society, is to be one of unarmed, trustful coöperation, — a force more powerful to hold in check the demon of violence than all the combined steel-clad ships that ever furrowed the ocean.[1]

The antagonism to war, produced by the various causes just mentioned, is greatly intensified by the enlarging sympathy between peoples created by the growth of popular government the past century. Even in Europe, where as yet there are only two republics, constitutional government has

[1] An example of the kind of concert here meant is found in the Universal Postal Union. This union, which originated no longer ago than in 1874, at its congress at Washington in 1896 admitted into its membership the last of the organized nations of the world, and became literally universal, — the first universal, international union ever formed.

made such progress that most of the sovereigns are no longer rulers except in name. Democracy as naturally creates sympathy and the spirit of coöperation between peoples as absolutism in government is the deadly foe of international friendship. It may take a republic like France a good while to throw off the effects of the absolutism of the past. The full influence of democracy in creating international sympathy ought not to be expected to be seen in a single generation or even in a single century, after so many centuries of absolutism have stamped their effects on the character of all peoples. In the United States, where absolutism has been unknown since the founding of the nation, sympathy with other peoples (this does not mean with other *governments*) is very large and steadily growing. In France the spirit of the people is moving steadily into sympathy with the people of other constitutional countries, as the republic becomes more sure to maintain a permanent existence. The peoples

of the South and Central American republics have even more sympathy one with another across the borders than the citizens of any one of these republics have with their own fellow-citizens, civil wars being more common among them than international wars. Though democracies now and then break out into war with great passion, against other peoples, or rather against the governments of other peoples, this must not be taken as invalidating the position that popular government is naturally conducive to international friendship. These fits of international violence are not chargeable to democratic principles, nor do they indicate that governments of the people have no tendency to prevent international ill feeling and strife. They only prove that even the best political institutions cannot suddenly remove *in toto* deep-seated prejudices, perverted habits of thought and long-felt dislikes and animosities. That popular governments naturally tend to create opposition to war is sufficiently clear from the

fact that in those countries where the people have most to do with political affairs, there opposition to war is strongest and most pronounced.[1] The notion of popular government is a constituent element in the new world society whose antagonism to war is growing to be so marked. It will be seen later that the idea of the people governing themselves has even a wider bearing than that which appears in international sympathy; that it is working out a veritable world government which is some day to embrace in its jurisdiction all the nations of the earth, or humanity as a whole.

In this connection one other thought deserves mention. It seems to me that the sense of a common manhood, of a common brotherhood, revealed through citizenship which possesses the franchise, or seeking to reveal itself through such citizenship, is more the cause of the present widespread opposition to war among organizations of

[1] Andrew Carnegie, *Triumphant Democracy*, chap. xvii.

laboring men than the mere desire not to have regular employment and steady living wages interfered with, powerful as this latter is as a motive. At any rate, the opposition to war on the part of democracies and constitutional governments and the antagonism of the labor interests to militarism move steadily and powerfully together.[1]

[1] For a careful discussion of the labor opposition to war, see the speeches of Professor John B. Clark of Columbia University, in the Mohonk Arbitration Conference Reports for 1896–97–98.

Since 1899, when this book first appeared, the labor organizations have taken a still stronger stand against militarism and war. The forty labor members of the recently elected British Parliament have taken the lead in that body in urging Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's government to take steps toward a reduction of armaments and securing at the second Hague Conference international agreement to this end. The American Federation of Labor at its annual meeting, in 1906, adopted a series of strong resolutions in support of world-organization and peace. The same is true of the labor unions in other countries.

IX

The Growing Triumph of Arbitration

NO one can understand the recent sudden development of interest in arbitration, not only in the United States and Great Britain, but also in many of the continental European countries, without taking into account this complex, economically sensitive and growingly humane and Christian condition of our modern world society. Arbitration has an interesting history of a hundred years, during which it has been successfully applied in over two hundred important cases of difficulty.[1] But it is not primarily its past

[1] *International Arbitrations*, John Bassett Moore. *The Arbitrations of the United States*, same author. *International Arbitration at the Opening of the Twentieth Century*, B. F. Trueblood. *International Tribunals*, W. E. Darby.

success which has created the recent enlarged interest in it. In fact, the new interest in it has set many intelligent people to work to hunt up its history, of which they previously knew practically nothing. What has created the fresh interest is the absolute moral and material necessity of arbitration both as a means of avoiding the widespread ruin which war now produces, and as an expression of the increased conscientiousness, reasonableness and forbearance of men in regard to their differences and their growing disposition to coöperate, wherever possible, for mutual benefit. It is the resistless logic of modern humane progress which has brought arbitration into such esteem. This method of composing disputes is not merely a product, but an integral part of the great federative movement of our day, some of whose leading features have been mentioned. Every part of this movement has had essentially the same causes, and every part has had a stimulating and supporting effect upon every other part.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, signed at Washington on the 11th of January, 1897, the first treaty of the kind ever signed between two nations, was scarcely more an expression of the great change in public sentiment as to peace and war than it was of the radically new spirit then beginning to actuate diplomacy. But for this new spirit in diplomacy, which dates particularly from the time of the Geneva Red Cross Convention of 1864,[1] this treaty would have been an impossibility. It is difficult to say whether diplomacy had done more for the promotion of public opinion in connection with this treaty or the latter for the development of the former. Anglo-American diplomacy has been for a hundred years more than abreast of Anglo-American public sentiment on the subject of arbitration, and the signing of this treaty in 1897 developed public sentiment on both sides of the water in a most remarkable degree.

[1] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "Geneva Convention."

The peace societies themselves, which have in recent years multiplied with such rapidity,[1] right in the midst of European bayonets even, and are devoting their attention largely to the promotion of arbitration as a permanent method of settling international controversies, are the creation of the same forces which brought arbitration into existence. Twenty years before the first peace society was organized, the Jay treaty between Great Britain and this country had provided for the settlement of three disputed questions by mixed commissions, — a form of tribunal which afterward developed into the temporary arbitration court, which has done so much in recent years to preserve and promote the peace of the civilized world. In 1814, still a year before the organization of any peace societies, the treaty of Ghent provided for the settlement

[1] There are now nearly five hundred peace associations, including branch societies, in European countries. Most of these have been organized since the Paris Peace Congress of 1889.

of three further disputes by mixed commissions. This fact does not in any way lessen the merit of the peace associations. Though they did not create the arbitration movement, and are only one of the many agencies which are developing it, yet they were its first prophets, giving the necessity of it the first clear and positive utterance. They have been its stanchest and steadiest friends. Up to a decade ago not a single resolution favoring arbitration had ever been introduced or voted on in any parliament that was not there directly by their agency.

Among the peace society agencies must be included the International Peace Congress, a permanent organization since 1889, meeting annually in the different large cities of the world; the Interparliamentary Peace Union,[1] a distinguished association

[1] The Interparliamentary Peace Union was organized at the time of the Paris Exposition in 1889, partly by the same men who originated the International Peace Congress. The union now has over two thousand members.

of members of parliaments, having over two thousand on its roll; the International Peace Bureau at Berne;[1] and certain special conferences, like that now held annually at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., and the national conferences on arbitration held at Washington in 1896 and 1904.

But though very powerful and efficient, and increasingly so as the number of the associations increases from year to year, the peace society agency has been only one of the large group of agencies — religious, juridic, political, diplomatic, social, commercial, financial — which have, severally and jointly, pushed arbitration to the front as the only rational method of removing controversies after direct negotiation has failed.

The merits and practicability of arbitration need no longer be pleaded. It has already won its case at the bar of international public opinion. Beginning in a tentative way with the United States and

[1] The Peace Bureau was established by vote of the Peace Congress at Rome in 1891.

Great Britain a hundred years ago, it has been applied with increasing frequency, in recent years particularly, to disputes of nearly every conceivable kind. The cases which it has disposed of have ranged all the way from those involving damages claims of a few thousands of dollars to those more serious controversies, touching territorial limits and transgression against national rights, which have cut deeply the national pride and sense of honor, and given rise to hot and long-continued diplomatic debate. Wherever it has been employed it has succeeded. There is not a real exception to be noted. The cases which it has settled have stayed settled. Not even the ghost of such a case has ever arisen to disturb anybody's tranquillity. It has been tried by nearly all nations, great and small, in the Old World and the New, the United States and Great Britain leading, the former with more than sixty cases and the latter with about the same number.[1]

[1] Benjamin F. Trueblood, "The United States,

Arbitration has not yet wholly succeeded in preventing wars, and may not for some time yet, but its record, in the hundred years since it first came into use, is a most remarkable one, and some day, when the history of human progress begins to be really written, this record will constitute a very instructive chapter. The advantages of this method of treating disputes are so great and so apparent to all thoughtful people that, having already been so successfully tried in such a variety of cases, it is sure speedily to become more and more general. Arbitration gives time for passion to cool. It affords opportunity to hunt up all the facts in a given case, an ignorance or one-sided knowledge of which is often the chief cause of irritation. It costs a mere pittance compared with war. It carries questions of right and justice to the forum of reason, where only they can be determined according to their merits. True

Great Britain and International Arbitration," in the *New England Magazine*, March, 1896.

honor is always vindicated before its tribunals. It leaves no bitter ranklings behind, no broken families, no devasted lands, no international feuds. It appeals to the better instincts of peoples. It removes prejudices and misjudgments. It creates sympathy and fellowship. Arbitration is not simply a cool and heartless method of disposing of difficulties; in its deeper significance it is a method of coöperation in promoting the true interests of the nations in their relations to one another. It not only peacefully composes their differences; it trains them as well in moral judgment and moral self-control. It makes their diplomacy more intelligent, more patient, more altruistic, and thus makes serious disputes much less likely to arise. A great arbitration like that of the Alabama dispute or of the Bering Sea seal question settles a whole group of international principles, and thus permanently advances international law. The Bering Sea case is a conspicuous example of the tendency of arbitration to

produce peaceful coöperation for the removal of troubles which not even an arbitral court may be able to reach. For these reasons arbitration, through the spirit out of which it springs and which it greatly develops and strengthens, will gradually remove the necessity of employing it at all, and will thus prove a powerful instrument in promoting the federation of the world.

The great question now in connection with this mode of settling differences is to make it permanent, to build it into a judicial system universally recognized and accepted by all the civilized nations.[1] To-

[1] See the Memorial of the New York State Bar Association, *Mohonk Arbitration Conference Report for 1896*, Appendix B, and the speeches given in the Report. See, also, *International Tribunals*, by Dr. W. Evans Darby. Lord Chief Justice Russell, in his address at Saratoga before the American Bar Association in 1896, gives the grounds why, in his judgment, temporary tribunals are preferable to a permanent one. An excellent reply to his argument will be found in the speech of Mr. Walter S. Logan at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference in June, 1898.

ward the accomplishment of this all the agencies of peace are turning. A hundred years is long enough to have successfully experimented. A hundred important cases, with many minor ones, settled in this way, and settled, every one of them, effectually and finally, are proof enough that the method is perfectly suited to the need, and capable of practically universal application. Permanent treaties of arbitration, providing for the setting up of a permanent tribunal, are the great desideratum of our complex, sensitive civilization. All disputes between the civilized nations ought forever hereafter, by their own sovereign and united determination, to be taken out of the realm of passion, caprice and violence, and brought within the domain of reason and law, as disputes between individuals have been. The reasons for the former are even more weighty than for the latter, and nothing but a false and silly sentimentalism stands in the way. The administrators of governments have much less ground for friction

between them than do individuals in the private walks of life. The populations of the nations have still less ground for enmity toward one another. International hostilities are the most needless and wicked of all hostilities. One can account for the rashness and even levity with which they are entered into, only on the ground of an almost total absence of thoughtfulness in regard to the real nature of international strife, both on the part of the government leaders and of the mass of citizens. The procedure of the heads of governments, in case of disputes, ought to be so prescribed as to leave them no opportunity for caprice or ambitious self-assertion, or for carrying away the unthinking masses into senseless war flurries by insidious appeals to passion and national pride. If this were done, if arbitration were established, under treaty obligations, as a permanent principle of international law, instead of being difficult to carry out in practice, as many suppose, it would, in my judgment, be found to be

incomparably easy, — much easier than the administration of the common law among individuals, where there is constant friction from close contact.

Just here lies the true significance of the Anglo-American treaty drawn in 1897.[1] This treaty was not needed to prevent the two nations from going to war. They are not likely ever to do that again, treaty or no treaty. They have fought but once, they have arbitrated many times, since they became separate nations over one hundred years ago. This treaty was a declaration to the world that they had found arbitration not only just and honorable, but easy and pleasant, and that they believed it safe to take the last obstacle out of its way and make it as easy as a fixed law of nature. Whatever obstacles the treaty

[1] This treaty was signed by Richard Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote on the 11th of January, 1897. It failed of ratification in the Senate, when the final vote was taken, on the 5th of May. Since October, 1903, 47 treaties of obligatory arbitration have been concluded, more about which will be said in the last chapter.

encountered in the Senate, and however tentative and imperfect the method which it prescribed may be supposed to be, what the great body of Americans and Englishmen think of arbitration, which the treaty proposed to set up as a rule of law between them, is that it is the right mode of settling all their differences, and at the same time a perfectly simple and easy one. "When it is once settled and in force, no one with Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins will be any more willing to part with it than with the railroad, the steamship, or the telegraph; and it will, in all probability, stop the clamorous mouth of war forever wherever the English tongue is spoken. The example will be contagious, and in a generation or two, if one may judge from the rapidity with which the arbitration movement is gaining strength in Europe, the entire civilized world will have set up for itself a permanent system of peaceful judicial settlement for disputes of every kind arising between the different nations. If the

Olney-Pauncefote treaty should fail of ratification in the Senate,[1] the effect will be merely to retard slightly or possibly to deflect from its most natural course the movement, but not in any way to seriously weaken or permanently check it. The forces whose working led to the negotiating of this treaty are so many and so strong that the final triumph of arbitration is as sure as the continuance of civilization. We may not be able to say just when or where, or in what manner, its great final triumph will begin, but of the certainty of that triumph in no remote future there can no longer be any reasonable doubt. When a permanent system of arbitration is once in operation among the civilized nations, there will be little difficulty in extending it to the still uncivilized quarters of the globe."

So I wrote in 1897, ten years ago, when this treaty was under consideration in the Senate. It failed of approval by only four votes, a two thirds majority being required

for ratification. Since that time the Hague Conference has been held, the International Court of Arbitration established, and forty-seven treaties of obligatory arbitration concluded between nations, two and two. To none of these is the United States a party, the eleven treaties signed by the late John Hay, Secretary of State, having failed to go into force because of a disagreement between the President and the Senate as to their respective prerogatives as parts of the treaty-making power. The arbitration movement has, however, developed and strengthened itself, in a general way, beyond the expectations of the most sanguine ten years ago, as will appear from the details given in the final chapter of this edition.

X

The United States of the World

AFTER arbitration, what? Hosea Biglow's advice, "Don't never prophesy onless you know," is most excellent, but it is not very easy to follow. Every man of love and goodwill has something of the prophetic gift in him, and must make his forecast of the outcome of the processes in whose final victory he believes.

Arbitration is not the highest attainment of which humanity is capable and which it is destined to reach. Arbitration is, as Goldwin Smith says,[1] at least in one aspect of it, "a litigious, not a friendly process, and is apt to leave heartburnings in the

[1] See article on "The Arbitration Treaty" in *The Independent*, March 25, 1897.

nation against which the award is given." Though all that I have said of the advantages of arbitration is true, yet the arbitration stage is one of very imperfect coöperation, where there is still friction, undue self-assertion, distrust and more or less estrangement. Beyond it is a stage where love and trust shall everywhere prevail, and all the nations' good shall be each nation's rule. We have even now a prophecy of this better stage which is to be reached in the relations of nations to one another. There are already multitudes of people in our civilized society who live, in their relations to one another, on a plane entirely beyond that of arbitration. They have nothing to arbitrate or to carry to the courts of law, because they either have no differences, or settle such as they have by the exercise of their own wits tempered with a little patience and mutual forbearance. All their ordinary dealings with one another — commercial, social, religious — are in a most real sense coöperative. This

class of persons is increasing continually, and they are paying less and less attention to national boundaries. The inevitable outcome of this sort of living among men in the same nation, and between men of different nations, will be the breaking down of international friction, the gradual disappearance of differences between nations, and the final evolution of international society to a state in which even arbitration will be practically unknown.

In the movement toward this higher state, two momentous results will follow quickly the adoption by the civilized world of a general permanent system of arbitration, namely, the reduction of armaments and a larger and more generous international coöperation. It is not easy to answer the questions raised in a former part of this discussion as to how the "bloated armaments" of the civilized world are to be gotten rid of. But arbitration is certainly to be the chief mediating agency in preparing the way for their removal. It

has already done much in pointing the way. While a system of arbitration is being worked out, by the slow process of historic growth, by negotiation and treaty stipulations, these armaments are sure to grow further both in extent and in burdensomeness, bringing for a brief time practically the whole world under their heartless tyranny. At least, everything at the present time points that way; though one cannot say what unforeseen event may come about of such a nature as suddenly to change the course which things seem likely to take. In spite of my optimism and much against my wish, the conviction has grown upon me that our own country, as well as others, is for a season to fall more and more under the curse of militarism, as it fell once, contrary to all the principles of its Constitution, under the black and blighting curse of slavery. The people are still only half awake to the insidiousness of the war spirit. The law of animosity and distrust has its charms for many of them. The blare and blaze of

the great military establishments of the Old World furnishes powerful enticements to the spirit of a young and mighty people which has not yet had experience of the ruinous and degrading influences of military tyranny. Many in high places believe, or pretend to believe, that a nation cannot be great without fighting, without sacrificing thousands of its sons on the battlefield, without exhibiting an irritable and haughty spirit toward some supposed enemy, and venting its wrath in deeds of blood. This evil seed in the nation is sure to bring forth its deadly harvest unless the people can be awakened speedily from their slumber.[1]

But when arbitration has at last come into general and permanent use throughout the civilized world, as there is every reason to believe that it will after a generation or

[1] Since the above was written, the war with Spain has been fought, and the disposition of the nation to enter upon a policy of military and naval expansion is much stronger than it was before.

In the ten years since 1897 the government's naval expenses have increased three hundred per cent.

two, then these great military establishments with all their abominations will come to an end. The end of them may come suddenly, as the result of a great war, or a series of great wars, the disastrous results of which will be so deeply and universally felt that the nations will never again permit militarism to take root and grow. The end is more likely to come by a process of neglect and natural decay, when arbitration, universally adopted, shall have made the uselessness of such war preparations, as well as their wickedness and folly, manifest. It is more likely still to come through simultaneous and gradual disarmament, entered upon by voluntary agreement, and possibly in connection with the adoption of some general system of arbitration.[1]

[1] Since the above was written, in 1897, little practical progress has been made in the solution of the problem of disarmament. The Hague Conference in 1899, the purpose of which was expressly the consideration of this subject, went only so far as to pass a resolution declaring "that a limitation of the military charges which now weigh upon the world is greatly to be desired in the

After this great consummation, the federative forces, freed from the immense restraint which militarism has put upon them and supported by the vast energies and resources now consumed on destructive agencies, will work out the unity of humanity in less time than the most hopeful of us dare to imagine. This unity will ultimately, in the very nature of the case, be not only moral, social and economic, but political as well. The nature of man, the common interests of peoples, the great currents of Christian and humane influence, the social, industrial and political movements of our time, the new modes of travel and intercommunication, the development of inter-

interests of the material and moral welfare of humanity." The British naval expenditures have doubled and those of the United States have trebled in ten years. The past two years, however, public opinion has become increasingly insistent that the governments shall find a way of escape from the incubus of the great military and naval establishments. The British government and House of Commons have responded to this public demand, as will be explained in the last chapter, in a way which insures the early serious study of the subject.

national law, the increasing international coöperation through diplomacy, conferences, commissions and arbitral boards, all foreshadow a complete political unity of the world, a great international world state, built up somewhat on the pattern of our union of States, with supreme legislative, judicial and executive functions touching those interests which the nations have in common. The reasons for such an over-state, constituted of all the nations, are precisely the same as for a federal union of local governments extending over a wide territory, like our own republic.

These reasons will readily occur to any thoughtful mind. The unification of law and its administration is among the first. Many consider the setting up of the Supreme Court to have been the chief triumph in the Constitution of the United States. The world needs a supreme tribunal to take international law out of the chaotic and reproachful state in which it now is and bring it up to something like the level of muni-

cipal law in the civilized nations. To this end it would seem that a parliament or legislative corps of some kind would be necessary also, and likewise a common executive.

Not less important a reason for a world state is the removal of friction and the danger of war by the creation of a feeling of unity in a common organization. One can easily imagine what the history of the United States would have been if they had become simply States without any common governmental tie. If the union of local governments in a national organization has done so much to remove friction and causes of war in the United States, in Great Britain, in France, in Italy, in Germany, what might not be expected in this regard from a union including them all?

A third reason for an international government is the ease and inexpensiveness with which, under such an arrangement, the common interests of the nations could be treated and adjusted. If the United States and Canada, for instance, in addition to their

independent local governments, were each connected with a wider government, charged with the duty of looking after the interests common to the two governments, — the seal question, the fisheries question, the border immigration question, — the mutual trade relations between the Canadian people and our own would long since have disappeared from the forum of discussion. At present many subjects of international concern — subjects of real importance — get little or no attention ; and if they are taken up, they are often treated in such a narrow, selfish way by the governments interested that frequently for years they are more and more confused by diplomatic subtlety, until passion becomes hot, and the nations are compelled, in order to get out of the muddle, either to fight or to resort at last to a little common sense. It is just here that is found the strongest reason for an over-state. These neglected interests, gathering everywhere on the borders of states as now organized, and interfering

with the normal development of the world society which is so rapidly creating itself, will as inevitably compel the establishment of a general world government as did the neglected mutual interests of the thirteen American colonies force the setting up of the United States general government, or those of the German states the German Empire.

Along what lines the movement toward this general world government will take place it is not easy to forecast, except in a general way. Two or three courses are open, any one or all of which may be followed. The United States of America may in time become really such. The very name seems to be prophetic. Canada, Mexico and Central America may some day, of their own accord, ask to be admitted into a federal union with the United States. In time a great South American republic of republics may be formed, through some movement or groups of movements akin to that already taking place

among the Central American states[1] and the British Australian colonies. Then may follow a federation of the two American continents. The United States of Europe, so long dreamed of and written of by European reformers,[2] seems to-day but the shadow of a name; but whoever remembers the history of the consolidation of France, or Italy, or Germany, or the still more remarkable history of the consolidation of the Swiss cantons composed of peoples of different races, speaking different languages, into a coherent national federation, will not say that a United States of Europe is an impossibility. On the contrary, the whole course of the modern history of nation-building foreshadows a European federa-

[1] This movement among the Central American states has never come to anything permanent. It is to be hoped that the present (1907) movement for settled peace among them may prove effective.

[2] The late Charles Lemonnier of Paris, president for many years of the International League of Peace and Liberty, was one of the chief promoters of the idea of a United States of Europe.

tion. The continent of Asia may some day have a like transformation; and that of Africa, too, renewed at last by a Christian civilization; and that of Australia before either of them, if one may judge from the federative tendencies already showing themselves between the colonies there.

If this should prove to be the way in which the world state is to work itself out, the islands of the sea will group themselves in with the continental federations where they naturally belong. At last these continental federations will flow together into a great world federation, the final political destiny of humanity, where all the larger hopes of love and fellowship, of peace and happy prosperity lie.

I do not pretend to assert that the actual order of movement will be as here outlined, but only that this is a possible, perhaps a probable order in which the federation of the world will come, at least in part. This forecast is in harmony with actual historic processes now working, and having for gen-

erations worked, at several points in civilized society.

Another course is possible. A great racial federation, as of the Anglo-Saxon people, may come first, with its centres of agglomeration in all parts of the world, which will gather to itself by an irresistible moral gravitation all other peoples. Racial federation is already playing its part very powerfully in the processes of civilization. Several races, it is true, are exhibiting, in greater or less degree, kindred phenomena. But racial distinctions are in many respects beginning to break down, because of the intermingling of peoples in all quarters of the globe. What may be styled the universal human characteristics, those belonging to the one race of man lying at the basis of all sub-races, are destined thus more and more to come to the front as against those which have marked off one portion of mankind from another. That race, whichever it may prove to be, which develops these general human characteris-

tics most fully and most rapidly, and throws off most completely all that is adventitious and unessential, will, in the nature of the case, prove to be the nucleus or furnish the nuclei about which civilization in all parts of the world will crystallize. Men will not care at last by what racial name they are called, or what language they speak, provided their highest interests of every kind are served. They will feel it more noble to be men and to speak the one universal language of men than to be Englishmen or Germans or Frenchmen, and to speak any of these great tongues. Whatever race shall prove itself fittest to lead in this federative process, whether the Anglo-Saxon, as now seems possible, or some other, will itself be modified, purified and strengthened for its work as the final world race by what it receives from the races which it draws to itself, and even from those which through weakness shall finally be eliminated.

The objections which may be brought, from the point of view of climate, against

the possibility of a world race, with more uniformity of characteristics than is found in the races as they now exist, are not so serious as might at first glance be supposed. The ease and rapidity with which men now travel, the expansion of ocean traffic, — one might almost say of ocean habitation, — and the growing habit, on the part of multitudes of families, of living a part of the time in one quarter of the globe and a part in another, make it at least not inconceivable that the time may come when there shall be much less difference in vigor and enterprise between the inhabitants of the tropics and of the temperate zones than there is to-day. Climate itself is probably in this indirect way to be one of the conquests of the coming humanity. Men will come more and more to be inhabitants of all the climates, shifting their abodes quickly from place to place, living on the seas, as an increasing number now do, and thus getting the best out of all parts of the world, while escaping with increasing cer-

tainty the weakening influences of any particular part. It is doubtless true, as Mr. Kidd argues,[1] that for a long time to come the tropics will have to be developed and in some manner and measure controlled by the people inhabiting the temperate regions. But it is difficult to believe that the rich tropical regions are always to be vassal, that their inhabitants are to remain permanently incapable of self-development and self-control. The new world race which is in process of building, by transformation, absorption and elimination, will make the matter of the inhabitancy and self-development and control of the tropics very different from what it is to-day.

It is scarcely necessary to state that this process of racial expansion, absorption and federation will, if it goes to the extent which now seems probable, result ultimately in the selection or creation of a single language for universal use. Even now the

[1] See his recently published book, *The Control of the Tropics.*

growing intercourse of different peoples is forcing upon attention the necessity of a universal language, and various schemes for the creation or selection of a language for universal use have been devised. But a universal language cannot be artificially created; it presupposes and requires a universal people.

The process of racial federation here outlined seems to me likely to play even a more important part in the development of the world state than that of simple geographical federation, though both are quite certain to work together.

It is not unlikely that the process of federation, whether it go on in one or both of the ways above indicated, will for some time to come not be entirely unattended by the incidents of war. One could wish that it might be otherwise. The federative forces and processes are in their nature pacific and opposed to the methods of war. They will ultimately make war impossible. But in the present confused movements of

society, in the actual relations of nations, small and great, weak and strong, to one another, there is so much of ambition and animosity, so much of ignorance and short-sightedness, intermingled with the operations of the elements of good, that progress toward social and political unity is sure to be attended with more or less clashing and discord. But whatever compacting and unifying of peoples and sections of the earth is seemingly brought about by the agency of war is really not due to it at all, but to the federative elements in men and society which work out their ends in some measure in spite of war and in the very midst of the disasters which it produces. If these federative forces were not present war would always be disintegrating, or if it produced unity at all, it would be the unity of death and of slavery, whose evil effects would have to be repaired before any real social progress could be made. No one ought, therefore, to be blinded as to the real nature of war because of its

seemingly beneficent agency in working out, in certain cases, the desired unity of peoples and sections of the earth.

An international state presupposes international citizenship. At first thought such a thing might seem impracticable. But if one can be a citizen of Pennsylvania and of the United States at the same time, and enjoy the privileges and feel the sacred obligations of both, why might he not just as easily be a citizen of a world state and of some particular nation simultaneously? The elements of an international citizenship already exist. People of different nations not only travel everywhere, but stop and live, own property and do business, pay taxes and submit to authority, among all other peoples. They retain the rights of citizens at home, and expect and receive most of the rights of citizenship among other peoples. Considerable numbers of these, though not expatriating themselves, never return to the country of their formal citizenship. The principle is now recog-

nized practically everywhere that a man has the right to live anywhere he wishes on the surface of the planet, to keep his local citizenship where he wants it, and at the same time to enjoy all the rights, privileges and immunities of local citizenship where he resides, except governmental rights in constitutional countries. All this development of international rights and privileges in our day points to a time not very far in the future when men shall literally be citizens of the world, and a world government suitable to the needs of world citizenship shall be set up for them.

Along with this international citizenship, the beginnings of an international or world government already exist, — legislative, executive, judicial, — in a decidedly chaotic state, it is true, but with signs of coming order. During the past century over one hundred international congresses met to determine certain questions of common interest, as the Congress of Vienna at the close of the Napoleonic campaigns, the Congress of

Paris after the Crimean war, the Congress of Berlin at the close of the Russo-Turkish conflict, and the Congress of Brussels to regulate certain interests in Africa. The Brussels Congress was a great development in humanity over that of Vienna, and even over the two intervening ones. Why should not such a congress, as Professor John Fiske has recently suggested,[1] meet frequently in the future, ultimately become a congress of all nations, and finally meet at stated times — say once in five or seven years — and in a fixed place or places? There is nothing irrational or impossible in the supposition, and the trend of affairs is certainly in that direction.

The idea of a congress of nations was a favorite one with the early advocates of peace, and was thoroughly elaborated by them.[2] Along with it went the idea of a high court of nations. Such a court is

[1] See Mr. Fiske's article on "The Arbitration Treaty" in *The Atlantic Monthly* for February, 1897.

[2] *Essay on a Congress of Nations*, by William Ladd.

already partly evolved out of the arbitration tribunals and temporary international commissions which have been constituted for the settlement of various questions raised in the course of modern international intercourse. The high court of nations will become a fixed world-institution before a congress of nations comes to meet regularly. The judiciary is becoming more and more influential in our time, and is already, as is known, leading the way in the creation of the great international organization of which I am speaking. The various congresses and conferences which are now annually held to promote the cause of universal peace have laid particular emphasis upon the idea of a permanent international tribunal of arbitration to take the place of the temporary tribunals constituted for the adjustment of differences as they arise.

The action of the nations at the first Hague Conference, of which more will be said in subsequent chapters, has already put the court of nations in advance of

the congress of nations, though the latter is now urged with increasing emphasis as the necessary counterpart of the former.

Among the beginnings of an international government may also be mentioned the generally recognized principles of international law,[1] the treaties of commerce now so numerous and important, the postal and telegraph unions in which many nations participate, and the modern diplomatic and consular service which binds all nations together in real political bonds. It is an actual fact of present international politics that every nation — every civilized nation at any rate — assists in governing, and is in turn partially governed by, every other nation, either directly through resident diplomacy, or indirectly through the power of collective public opinion expressing itself in

[1] See J. K. Bluntschli's *Die Bedeutung und die Fortschritte des modernen Völkerrechts.* See, also, the recent work of Professor T. J. Lawrence, *The Principles of International Law.* All the recent works on international law give more or less attention to the subject of peace and the means of maintaining it.

the rules of international law or in various forms of concerted international activity for what is supposed to be the common good. There is much that is crude and selfish, and not a little that is inhuman and cruel, in this incipient international government as we now see it evolving; but there is also something that is in the truest sense humane and Christian, and this latter is clearly increasing with the passing of each decade. The public opinion of the world society, as it is now capable of expressing itself with such swiftness and concentration, is sure to force the cruel and the unjust more and more into the background and to establish the good and the helpful.

At first thought, the management of a world government might seem to be attended with insuperable difficulties, because of the extent of territory over which its administration would extend and the great variety of national character and institutions with which it might supposedly have to deal. But really, with our present means

of rapid travel and practically instantaneous communication by telegraph and cable, the management of such a government from a single centre would be much easier than it was fifty years ago to govern Ohio from Washington, or the north of England from London. Its administration would also be comparatively easy because its jurisdiction would be limited to a few great subjects of universal character, all purely national affairs being managed as now by the respective nations in the exercise of their local sovereignty. It is no more difficult to administer the government of the United States than it is that of the State of Pennsylvania or of Ohio, and less so than it is that of a great complex, compact municipality like the city of New York or Chicago. The farther removed government is from the entanglements and friction of conflicting local interests and the more it deals only with matters of wide general interest, the easier its administration becomes. For these reasons it does not seem irrational

to suppose that a world government might prove in practice the easiest of all governments to administer, at least from the point of view of these objections.

As to the enforcement of the legal enactments of the world government, little difficulty might be expected. An international police is certainly not impossible, if it should ever be needed to enforce the decrees of a congress of nations. Such a state as we are supposing will not, however, be established until arbitration generally prevails and war is practically a thing of the past. Law will then need few, if any, sanctions, and force will play a very small part in its execution. The sense of honor and loyalty to right will prove amply sufficient to secure obedience. The chief functions of the government of the world state will be legislative and judicial, and its executive duties will be largely those of simple direction and guidance rather than of compulsion.

With the setting up of this world state,

whose establishment is demanded by the as yet unfulfilled destiny of the race and clearly indicated by the progress of society, the peace of the world, so far as that means the cessation of war, will be forever sealed. International chaos and anarchy, as they now so deplorably exist, will have passed away. Many of the vexatious questions with which national governments now have to deal, arising as they do from international complications, will disappear. National governments, like our present state governments, will then make it their business to care for and promote the national interests — the real interests of the people — and not to meddle with the affairs of other peoples, which is now considered in some countries the chief mark of statesmanship. The general effect of all this in the further promotion of industrial and social prosperity and peace, of education and religion, will be magical. The whole of human society will feel at all points a thrill of new life and hope. Reason, con-

science and law will be enthroned. Love and goodwill will then be considered strong and worthy motives, as is none too frequently the case now.

Such an organization will not mean the stagnation or the end of civilization. On the contrary, it is the presupposition of a civilization which shall be truly human and Christian, and hence vigorous and strong. The thought, the energy, the material wealth, now consumed in destructive rivalry will be turned into beneficent coöperative enterprises, and the earth will for the first time in its history really begin to "blossom like the garden of the Lord." Above all, the spirits of men, delivered from the bondage of hate and fear, from which but few anywhere under present conditions wholly escape, will be free to enter into each other's thoughts, purposes and attainments, in a spontaneous, natural way, which will make of the whole race a wise, strong, prosperous and happy brotherhood, such as we have so far seen in but small por-

tions of it. The end of the reign of international hate, — the beginning of the reign of universal brotherhood, — who can measure either its spiritual or its material significance?

I do not delude myself into supposing that such a state of states as that here indicated can be artificially created, as the French philosophers would have constructed off-hand their social compact.[1] States grow before they are made. Their formal constitution, if they are to be anything more than temporary structures, is the last act in a drama extending over long periods. So will it be with the federation of the world in an international state. What leads me to believe that such a federation is comparatively near is that the forces and processes which are evolving it have been long working, and that in recent years the products of their working — swift, uniform and well-nigh universal — have become so man-

[1] *Du contrat social, ou principes du droit politique*, by J. J. Rousseau.

ifest and so numerous that the significance of it all cannot be mistaken. When the wheat is knee-high in the field one is justified in believing that the harvest time will come soon, unless the course of nature goes awry. The great idea of a world federation in some form has gotten clearly into men's minds. It is too powerful, too attractive and inspiring, to be resisted. It appeals, both on the material and the spiritual side, to the deepest needs and to the loftiest hopes of the race. All obstacles to its realization will be broken down, if not to-morrow, then afterwards. How soon, will depend largely on the purpose, the intelligence, the heart, which those already possessed of the great idea shall put into the work of reconstructing and reorganizing humanity on a world basis. War, with its desolations and incredible follies, may still sweep over portions of the earth while the demons of distrust and violence are being cast out. But its days are nearly numbered. Its glory is fast turning to shame. It is

everywhere on the defensive. The great federative movement, which has been gathering strength for nearly twice a thousand years of Christian progress, — nay, in whose pulses is beating the growing life of all the human ages, — will peacefully occupy the places of ruins left of war, and will build at last a temple and city of concord for the whole earth, within whose holy gates the noise of battle shall never be heard.

Tennyson's dream will then be more than realized; there will be no longer any battle-flags to furl.

XI

The First Hague Peace Conference

THE International Peace Conference called by the Czar of Russia, and looked forward to with so much interest and solicitude when the first edition of this book was published, met at The Hague on the 18th of May, 1899, and continued in session till the 29th of July. Twenty-four independent nations and two semi-independent ones were represented in the Conference. All the European nations, twenty in number, two from North America and four from Asia, sent delegates. Only those which had diplomatic representatives at St. Petersburg had been invited. These did not include the states of South and Central America.

The twenty-six nations represented, with

their dependencies in Asia, Africa, Australia, North and South America and the oceans, contain over twelve hundred millions of people, or more than four fifths of the population of the globe. Territorially, not much less than five sixths of the earth's surface was represented. The whole of Europe, the whole of North America, practically the whole of Asia, the Australian continent, most of Africa and of the islands of the sea participated, by direct or indirect representation, in this unique gathering. Only South and Central America and a few small sections of territory elsewhere had no share in it. It was, therefore, both in point of populations and of territory represented, much more nearly a world-conference than ever before gathered in human history.

Looked at from the point of view of language, the gathering was no less remarkable. No such array of tongues ever came together before since the differentiation of human speech began. Though

French was the official language of the deliberations, the delegates spoke, as their native tongues, no less than twenty different languages. One might have heard at The Hague English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, Italian, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, Dutch, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Greek, Turkish, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Servian, Hungarian, Polish, Persian, Siamese and possibly Arabic. These languages are the vehicles of the science, the art, the literature, the commercial transactions, the political wisdom, the religious life and thought of the entire modern world. Those not in this list, with one or two exceptions, stand for almost nothing in the permanent growing life of the world.

From another kindred point of view the character of the Conference was no less significant. The men of which it was composed were among the most eminent public men of the time. More than thirty of them were actual ambassadors or ministers plenipotentiary of their governments to foreign

courts, the men who constitute the most powerful political tie binding the nations together into the incipient international government to which reference has been made in a previous chapter. The cities at which these embassies and ministries were located include all the great capitals of the civilized world, — those which dictate the policies and control the political and economic destinies of men under every sky, — Washington, London, Paris, St. Petersburg, Berlin, Rome, Vienna; and a number of the important smaller capitals, as The Hague, Brussels, Copenhagen, Berne, etc. Among the delegates were eminent educators from both hemispheres, distinguished students and expounders of international law, capable and experienced jurists, eminent cabinet officers, senators and representatives, military and naval experts of the first rank. This body of public men might doubtless have been duplicated in ability, experience and fitness, but it could not probably have been surpassed by an equal number from

among living statesmen and publicists. Many of these men, particularly the leaders in the Conference, were of an exceptionally high moral order and eminently progressive in their ideas, representing political humanity, not as it is only, but as it ought to be and gives promise of being. Practical men though they were, a fine idealism lay at the heart of all their efforts and saved them from the dreary rounds of a merely formal finessing diplomacy. There were dusty conservatives among them, but they were few and not very active.

All that is highest, best and most promising, therefore, in modern civilization was representatively present in this great international gathering. Some of the inferior elements of the time, survivals of the past, dead weights on the upward movement of the world, were, to be sure, present; but they counted for little in the active counsels of the Conference and in its decisions. What was done, was done in spite of them, at least without their aid. But this element

was so small that it is hardly fair to mention it at all. The outlook of the Conference was toward the future, and all that was done, insignificant as some have skeptically thought it to be, was done in the spirit of the coming time, of the brotherhood, unity and coöperation of humanity.

From the foregoing points of view it is no exaggeration to say that the Hague assembly was the beginning of "the parliament of man," the first in what we are justified in believing will be a series of world-councils, through which humanity as a whole will deliberate and decide, in the spirit of genuine fraternity and unrestrained sympathy, upon the questions of universal and permanent interest to its well-being. How far the Conference went in laying the foundations for "the federation of the world," in the sense in which this has previously been spoken of, will be seen further on.

After what has been said in previous chapters, it is needless to dwell here more than briefly on the causes which led to the

Hague meeting, though a clear view of their nature is necessary for a proper understanding of the relation of the Conference to the future federation of the world. One must get beyond the Czar's Rescript to find them. This now famous document — which has been ranked with Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence, and Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, but which in my judgment holds a unique place beyond these and every other political paper prior to its publication — had its origin in the same sources as the Conference, of whose work it was only the preliminary stage. The Rescript was not an accident; it was not the product of a capricious emperor's whim, nor of a nation's long-headed, scheming ambition. Behind it were the accumulated forces of centuries of Christian progress. Its origin in Russia and in the royal family is not surprising to those acquainted with the hereditary peace sentiments of the family since the days of Alexander I, and with the fact that the causes which made

such a conference inevitable had long been working in Russia, some of them more powerfully there than elsewhere, perhaps. The Czar was only the mouth-piece — a willing and highly praiseworthy mouth-piece, of course — of longings, purposes and movements of which he himself was rather the product than the creator. The need of Russia in this regard — a need voiced in the utterances of Tolstoy and in the great work of Mr. Bloch, "The Future of War" — was the need of the whole civilized world. The honor of the Czar in connection with the matter was that in him and his nation, in spite of appearances to the contrary, the movement of civilized peoples towards relief from the curse of militarism and towards fuller friendship, larger sympathy, and completer and more harmonious coöperation found the line of least resistance. So great was the pressure throughout the civilized world towards the end which the Czar proclaimed as worthy of the best efforts of the nations combined,

that when the Conference met his work was practically done. The whole matter passed at once beyond his control. While acknowledging with profound respect the honor due to the Russian emperor for his exalted service, the Conference proceeded to do the work which the world needed done, so far as it could be accomplished at that time, as if he had not been in existence. Called to provide especially for putting a check upon the ceaseless growth of armaments and war-budgets, it proceeded, not to do this at all directly, but to lay, in its provision for a permanent court of arbitration, the political foundations of ultimate universal and permanent peace, without which the best possible plan of disarmament, or even of reduction of armaments, would not have had the least chance of success.

These causes, which were operating powerfully in all Christian lands, which moved the Czar, which called the Conference into existence and rallied to its support a powerful public sentiment in many countries,

which determined its spirit and controlled its deliberations, have been sufficiently elucidated in foregoing chapters. A mere rehearsal of the most prominent of them is all that is necessary here. The development of the Christian spirit throughout civilized lands, the movement of missions into all parts of the world, bearing the principles of the Fatherhood of God and the divine kinship of men, the development of the humane spirit, the advancement of education, general intelligence and ethical conceptions and sentiments constitute one group of these causes. Another set is found in the growth and expansion of commerce, whose marvelous cosmopolitanism has united all the nations of the earth in bonds on whose maintenance depend not only many of the higher refinements, but the very life itself of multitudes; the national and international movements for the improvement of industrial conditions; and the extended and intricate monetary and credit systems of the business world. We find still another group in

modern methods of travel and intercommunication, by which all parts of the world, all the doings and happenings of men, all the characteristics, customs and institutions of peoples are brought into constant, immediate, in many cases almost instant, contact with one another. The transformation of political ideas and institutions, the progress of the sense of justice and human rights, of democratic government and the consequent enlarged sympathy between nationalities, furnish a fourth group. A fifth set of causes reveal themselves in the international congresses political, religious, commercial, scientific, historical, philological, philanthropic, etc., which constitute such a marked feature of the modern world. A sixth group is seen in the system of modern diplomacy, with its ministries crossing and intercrossing between the capitals of all sovereign states. A last group — not to pursue the enumeration further — is found in the various organizations and lines of effort for the direct promotion of the cause of

international arbitration and peace. This includes the work of the peace societies and congresses, of the Interparliamentary Union, of the International Law Association and of many individuals and associations, put forth to promote larger international friendliness, the settlement of disputes by temporary tribunals, the establishment of treaties of arbitration and a permanent tribunal. If one remembers all these groups of causes, acting singly and combined, and observes their swift and tremendous accomplishments, and then sets before his eyes the monstrous obstacle with which they have to contend, hanging like a paralyzing nightmare over the heart of the world, — the all-devouring militarism of the day corrupting, consuming, threatening with final moral, physical and political ruin the whole race, — one finds little difficulty in understanding the gathering of such a world-assembly as that which met at The Hague on the 18th of May, 1899.

Turning to the work of the Conference,

its spirit and its results, the strongest reasons are found for magnifying its importance as a historic turning-point in the unification of the world.

When the Conference met there was general skepticism among its members as to any useful results likely to come from its deliberations. Worse than this, there was a certain amount of levity on the part of some delegates, as if the whole thing were a diplomatic joke. But all this was superficial and lasted but a day or two. When the delegates came together, looked into each other's faces, saw what manner of men they were, began to think seriously of the nature of the mission which had brought them together, and learned from each other, through the multitudinous messages and memorials which poured in upon them, how large a public interest in the Conference was felt in all civilized lands, the levity and skepticism vanished. Under the lead of a few eminent men, — Hon. Andrew D. White, Sir Julian Pauncefote, Mr. de Staal,

Mr. Léon Bourgeois, and Mr. Auguste Beernaert, — men whose names will some day outrank those of any of the great historic leaders of military campaigns, the task which had called them together began to reveal its immense significance and was taken seriously in hand.

In order to study critically the three important subjects indicated in the Czar's second circular, — the laws of war, reduction of armaments, and the pacific settlement of international disputes, the Conference was divided into three sections, in each of which every nation participating was represented. No more faithful and conscientious work was ever done by any body of men than was done in these sections and their sub-committees during the two months of critical study which they gave to the subjects before them. There was no diplomatic finessing over green tables, no disposition to evade the real issues by a show of fine words and meaningless formulas, no dodging of difficulties,

no effort to turn the Conference to other ends than those for which it had assembled, no admission to consideration of worthy objects with which it was not competent to deal.

Not only was the Conference remarkable for the practical, straightforward and conscientious way in which it did its work, but the spirit of harmony and coöperation which animated it was as fine as it was unexpected. It would have been a credit to any national assembly. There had been talk, on the eve of the gathering, of cliques and rings and political combinations, to take advantage of the occasion for the accomplishment of certain national schemes. But none appeared. The Conference moved as one body, animated with one spirit, from beginning to end. The incident of the German opposition to any measure of obligatory arbitration was no real exception. The objection was made in an open and straightforward way. The Conference met it in a considerate and conciliatory spirit, and the result

was that, though the German delegation had up to that time stood silent and aloof, they afterwards fell into line and worked in sympathy and harmony with the rest of the body. There was no concealment of thought among the delegates, no assumption of superiority by one over another, no lobbying for position and precedence, no browbeating, no effort of the delegates of the great nations to override those of the small. You would not have suspected that Ambassador De Staal, the distinguished president of the Conference, was from a great power and Mr. Beernaert of Belgium from one of the smallest. National chauvinism, suspicion and soreness were entirely absent. Pauncefote of England fraternized in the most intimate and sincere way with Bourgeois of France. During all the earnest and long-continued discussions, opinions were considerately heard and mutually respected. The one purpose which ruled the deliberations was to find out how much could be done, with the support of all the delegates,

towards the accomplishment of the objects for which the Conference had been called. The friendly relations between the delegates grew stronger and stronger till the very end.

It may be said that the occasion demanded just such a spirit as this. That is true. But occasions often get disappointed. Men in the best national assemblies sometimes so far forget the peaceful self-composure demanded of them as to indulge in throwing congressional reports and law books at each other's heads. It is one of the most remarkable things about the Hague gathering that, notwithstanding the jealousies and friction between several of the powers represented, the spirit appropriate to the occasion did not once break down but grew in strength steadily till the close. How shall we interpret this extraordinary occurrence, where exactly the opposite had been expected and prophesied? We are justified in believing, it seems to me, that this lofty spirit was imperatively imposed

upon the Conference. It was a necessary public expression of the larger feeling of unity and coöperation now so extensively prevailing among the nations of the world, in spite of the animosities and feuds inherited from the past. Are we wrong in setting it down as a prophecy of the spirit which shall one day prevail in all international councils met to deliberate upon the large common interests of the peoples of the world, — a spirit which shall at last break down all international prejudices, remove the sting from all international differences and thus make war forevermore impossible?

Passing to the practical results obtained at The Hague, the foremost of them may be set down as the Conference itself, the fact that such a meeting was held and did some notable work in a harmonious, coöperative spirit. It was a unique gathering. No such meeting had ever before been attempted in the annals of man, — an official meeting of statesmen from many lands, for the pure

purposes of peace. Men derided the Czar as a foolish dreamer, and said that it could not be done, that it was foredoomed to failure. These powers, with their ambitions, their historic dislikes, their mutual distrust, their great armies massed against one another, could not possibly send together a lot of men who would not quarrel and break up in confusion, and make the world more distracted than before. But the thing which the skeptics said could not be done was done, with most marked success. It has thus been proved that, in spite of their dislike and fear of one another, the nations can come together in the spirit of men and brothers and discuss and decide upon great and delicate questions of common concern. The most difficult of all international deeds has been done. What the nations have found easy to do they are certain to do again, and out of the Hague Conference is sure to come, as many of the delegates believed, a series of similar conferences constituting an entirely new era in the

management of international affairs. This is an attainment of the first magnitude. If the Conference had done nothing beyond this, it would have abundantly justified itself and done much toward the ultimate unification of the world.

Of the three measures agreed upon by the Conference the least important, at first sight, would seem to be that which gives a new and improved statement of the laws and customs of war. It has been often said, with perfect truth, not only by the advocates of peace but by the foremost military men themselves, that war is essentially cruel and infernal and that it cannot be civilized and humanized. Two things, however, may be said in behalf of what is called humanizing war. First, it is the result of international coöperation. Now, international coöperation for the restriction, in any measure, of a recognized evil is a very valuable thing. It brings the whole body of international thought and public opinion to bear upon the evil, and

under the searchlight of this united opinion the evil is sure to pass more and more into disfavor. It is in this way that much of the opposition to war itself as an inhuman and irrational method of settling disputes has grown up. It is a most instructive historical fact that the whole body of modern international law grew out of the great work of Hugo Grotius on the law of war and of peace (*De Jure Belli ac Pacis*), a work written, not to oppose war in itself, but its side excesses, its unnecessary cruelties and the rashness and morbid eagerness with which it was entered into by the princes of his time. When Grotius wrote his book, war was a game of which there were no rules. There were no limits to the excesses of soldiers off the field of battle, and none to the extent to which any conflict might spread. To-day wars do not often spread beyond the parties to the dispute. The nations form a cordon around them and keep the bloody business within the ropes. Prisoners are no longer, save in excep-

tional cases, mercilessly abused and killed. Non-combatants are respected, and many shocking evils, once of every-day occurrence, are almost unknown. International coöperation in restricting war and cutting off many of its attendant cruelties and sufferings has created an international conscience in regard to these things, without the pressure of which we should have had, with modern perfection of instruments of death, a series of great conflicts attended with every variety of horror, which would have left the civilized lands a "howling wilderness." The Hague Convention, further enlarging and more clearly defining the restrictions now imposed upon combatants, may be expected to carry this humane movement still farther, bearing with it an ever-increasing dread of and moral revulsion from the battlefield itself, whose cruel, ghastly, loathsome nature can never be changed until it ceases to be.

The other value of what is called humanizing war is that this process carries the

sentiments and practice of kindness and mercy nearer to the heart of the evil. It is out of the prevalence of these sentiments in the hearts and practices of men that the abolition of war must ultimately come, if it ever comes. Whatever, therefore, enlarges the practical sphere of social kindness and tenderness, even though it be on the borders of the conscience-deadening battlefield, will cause society in general to look with increasing horror and intolerance on the slaughter and fury of battle, in which is found not a single element of humanity and mercy.

The Convention providing for the extension of the work of the Red Cross societies to maritime warfare needs little comment. All that has been said of the Convention in regard to the laws of war is applicable with much greater force to this; for the work of the Red Cross is one of pure mercy. Besides, a maritime Red Cross is the logical completion of that provided for in the Geneva Convention of 1864 in

connection with land warfare. Before the Hague Conference, Red Cross work had already been done in connection with some naval battles under the general provisions of the Geneva Convention. Though the Conference did not break new ground in this direction, it did a very great service by providing for the official extension of this humane institution from the land surface of the globe to the three times greater water surface, on which probably most of the battles of the future will be fought.

On the subject of reduction of armaments, the chief object for which the Conference was called, nothing directly was done. The matter did not even come to serious discussion. Many of the members, and some entire delegations, felt deeply that something ought to be done for the relief of Europe. But when the subject was brought forward by Mr. De Staal, on behalf of Russia, Germany immediately opposed. The sentiment in favor of action was so weak in other prominent delegations,

and the general feeling so strong that public sentiment in the nations would not support any effective measure, that the subject was dropped. But by the manner in which it was dropped the Conference went a long way in preparing the ground for future action. A resolution was introduced by the first delegate from France, Mr. Bourgeois, and unanimously adopted, declaring it to be the judgment of the Conference "that the limitation of the military charges resting upon the world is greatly to be desired, for the increase of the material and moral well-being of humanity." This resolution was a corporate condemnation of the present system of "bloated armaments," whose private condemnation had already become deep and widespread among the peoples. When a great public evil is thus publicly condemned by a representative body of men acting officially, the evil is doomed, however far off may be the day when it shall be put on the scaffold.

Besides their doubt about the support of

the governments and public opinion at home, many members of the Conference felt that any scheme of reduction of armaments would be sure to fail unless there were first in successful operation a well-devised system of settling international controversies by peaceful means. For this reason, as well as for its own sake, they set themselves so earnestly to prepare a scheme for a permanent international court of arbitration. In addition to laying the corner-stone of future disarmament in the drafting of this great scheme, the Conference also did something more in the same direction. It declared itself in favor of the prohibition of the dropping of projectiles and explosives from balloons, of the employment of projectiles designed to emit asphyxiating gases, and of the use of explosive or expansive bullets; only the United States and Great Britain failing to record their votes in favor of the last two prohibitions. The Conference did, therefore, much toward preparing the way for disarmament,

the necessity of which is felt more and more powerfully each year in Europe.

Much the most important of the three conventions drawn up by the Conference was that providing for the pacific settlement of international controversies by means of commissions of inquiry, mediation and a permanent court of arbitration. Around this centred the interest of the Conference. The delegates felt that public sentiment was ripe for action in this direction. Numerous messages came to them from all quarters of the civilized world. They had before them the successful issue of more than a hundred important arbitrations. The development of international relations and international law had prepared the way for action. Four of the great powers represented — the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and Italy — brought with them well-digested plans for a general arbitration convention. There was no way of escape from the duty pressed home to the Conference from all

sides. No attempt was made to escape it, unless possibly the action of the German delegation in the early part of the Conference may be called such. The subject was taken up with an interest and zeal which surprised even the most ardent advocates of peace. There was no contest in getting it forward. Not a speech was made in opposition. There was no fear of going beyond what the governments and peoples at home would support. For two months, day after day, the subject was wrestled with by the ablest men of the Conference, — experienced diplomats, experts in international law, jurists of large legal experience. The result was a document which must always hereafter be considered as the Magna Charta of the new internationalism of peace, the reign of love and law, which is to take the place of the spirit of hate and the method of "blood and iron."

It has been charged that the members of the Conference, finding that nothing could be done in the way of disarmament, and

feeling that they must not totally disappoint those at home who were expecting so much of them, in sheer desperation fell upon the subject of arbitration. No greater freak of fancy than this was ever recorded. Arbitration came to the front at The Hague because it belonged there. After a century of the most unqualified success in the adjustment of many and perplexing disputes it came to the Conference to have the crown of the world's public approbation officially set upon its head. And the setting of this crown in the form of a permanent court of arbitration was as serious and devout a political proceeding as any page of history can show.

A brief examination of the principal features of this great scheme will give us a right conception of the influence which it is likely to have in diminishing resort to war and in promoting larger international trust and fellowship.

The first part of the convention provides for mediation. The powers entering into

the treaty agree that in case of grave difference of opinion they will, before appealing to arms, have recourse, as far as circumstances permit, to the good offices or mediation of one or more powers. The form recommended is that each of the disputing states shall choose one power, and the two powers so chosen shall have charge for thirty days, unless some other time is specially agreed upon, of the matter in dispute, with a view to amicable arrangement. Provision is also made that powers not interested in the dispute may offer their good offices, even during the course of hostilities, and that the exercise of this right shall never be considered by either of the disputants as an unfriendly act.

The theory of this scheme of mediation is that time for cool deliberation is of the utmost importance in the case of serious differences, and that disinterested powers are much more likely to find a way of honorable compromise than those directly concerned. Mediation at the request of

contending states is already a well-known practice in international relations. This scheme greatly extends its scope. It makes mediation possible before the outbreak of hostilities, and also on the initiative of neutral states. It puts every nation entering into the convention under the friendly eye and consideration of all the other nations. Its adoption is a solemn public declaration by the nations jointly that they are a family, and that every dispute between two of them is in some measure the concern of every other member of the family. The recommendations of the mediating powers are to have no compulsory force, but it is not likely that disputing states asking for mediation or consenting to it would ever reject the friendly counsel given. The sense of honor would be sufficient to secure their assent, just as it has secured the acceptance of the judgments rendered by courts of arbitration for more than a hundred years. To what extent the nations will resort to mediation under this conven-

tion only time can determine. The lessons of history, the sense of obligation imposed by the adoption of the convention, and the increasing complexity of international relations make it fairly certain that the scheme will not long remain unused.

The second part of the convention provides for joint commissions of inquiry, in less serious cases, where disputes arise from divergence of opinion as to matters of fact. These commissions are to make an impartial and conscientious examination of the facts in the case, and report the result of their investigations to the governments interested. Here their work ends. The value of such preliminary investigation, before an attempt is made to arrive at agreement, cannot be overestimated. Misunderstanding as to facts often creates irritation and bitterness for which there is no ground whatever, and many wars have resulted from just such an irrational state of affairs. Once take time for cool and deliberate inquiry, and clear up all questions of fact, as these

commissions would be expected to do, and more than half the supposed causes, not of war only but also of senseless contention and railing, would be swept entirely away.

The remainder of the convention deals with the subject of arbitral justice and the permanent international court of arbitration. Here the Conference did its real work, — the work which will give it its high place of honor in coming time, the work which opens a new era in the history of humanity.

The convention provides that each of the nations entering into the agreement shall appoint, as members of the court for a term of six years subject to reëlection, not more than four persons of recognized competency in dealing with questions of international law and of the highest moral reputation. From this body of men, always in existence, always studying and developing international law, always having before them the class of questions about which differences between nations arise, shall be chosen a certain number to act as arbitrators whenever two

governments wish to refer a controversy to the court. Except in case of special agreement the number to be chosen is five, two by each of the powers and an umpire by these. A bureau of the court is established at the Netherlands capital, which is to serve as the office of record, and as the intermediary of all communications relating to the sittings of the court. The convention also provides for a permanent Council of Administration, to be composed of the diplomatic representatives of the signatory powers accredited to The Hague, and presided over by the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs. This Council is to organize and direct the bureau, to have the decision of all administrative questions relating to the working of the court, and to make a report yearly to the governments of the work of the court and of the expenses.

The use of the court by the signatory powers is to be entirely voluntary. Obligatory arbitration could not be reached by the Conference. But though resort to the

court is voluntary, it is morally certain that nations which have of their own accord set up a tribunal of such high character, in which will be found the foremost international jurists of the world, will from the very beginning, in all ordinary cases, make use of it, instead of creating temporary tribunals or running the risk of war. As time goes on more and more important and delicate cases will be carried before its bar, and there is every reason to hope that confidence in its ability and fairness will ultimately become so great that its jurisdiction in international controversies will become universal. The very existence of the court will tend to lessen differences and will make their settlement by diplomacy, when they arise, much more certain.

This great scheme lifts arbitration, which has already had a century of unbroken success in an experimental way, to a position of organized permanency in the realm of international method. It extends potentially, and in time we may hope will extend actu-

ally, the principles of reason and law to the whole realm of international affairs, where heretofore has reigned so largely a chaos of unreason and of violence. Through its provision for an international bureau and a permanent Council of Administration at The Hague it virtually creates a capital of the world. The position of minister to the court of the Netherlands, involving membership in this Council, will hereafter be considered of the highest order, and statesmen of the first rank will be chosen for it. The Conference therefore did something of much more value in its ultimate effects upon the world than the creation of a permanent system for the adjustment of controversies, or even than the extension of law and reason to the whole realm of international affairs. It created a permanent peace centre, through the Council which it set up, and put the idea of peace in the forefront as the supreme directing principle in international relations. The men who are sent to The Hague as ministers plenipo-

tentiary from the powers will through their connection with the permanent court have this idea always before them. From them its influence must inevitably spread through the whole sphere of diplomacy. Their annual reports to their governments at home will keep the subject fresh before the minds of the peoples of the several countries. Men will become accustomed to looking to this centre of peaceful judicature during periods of contention and passion, and the ultimate effect in international life will be the same as that which courts of law have produced in the interior life of the separate nations, — a state of general and durable peace, where resort to war is now practically unknown.

It is impossible except in these general terms to trace the many and far-reaching effects of this Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Controversies. But through it one thing has become perfectly clear, namely, that the federation of the world is no longer simply an ideal or a

rational deduction from processes of development everywhere going on. The Hague Conference resulting in this convention has made it already in part a fact[1].

[1] The best book in English on the Conference and its work is that by Frederick W. Holls, secretary of the United States delegation, entitled *The Peace Conference at The Hague.*

XII

The Hague Court and Recent Progress toward World-Unity

THE setting up of the Hague Court, the beginning of a permanent and regular judicial order among the nations, may justly be styled one of the greatest events of history. This took place something less than two years after the close of the Conference. By April, 1901, some sixteen of the signatory powers had ratified the convention providing for the permanent International Court of Arbitration, and appointed their members of the tribunal. The Administrative Council, composed of the ministers accredited to the Netherlands government, organized at The Hague, established the Bureau of the Court, as provided for in the convention, and the tribunal was declared by the Netherlands Minister

of Foreign Affairs to be duly constituted and ready for business. Since that time all of the signatory powers, except Turkey and Montenegro, have ratified the convention and appointed members of the court. Norway, also, since her separation from Sweden, has named representatives in the tribunal.

Contrary to the expectations of many, the court was put into operation within a year of the time when it was declared established, whereas the United States Supreme Court had to wait more than two years for its first case. The governments of the United States and of Mexico set the tribunal in operation in 1902 by the reference to it of the Pious Fund controversy. Since that time the Japanese House-Tax case, the Venezuela Preferential-Payment case and the controversy between Great Britain and France as to their respective treaty rights in Muscat have been referred to the court and adjudicated. In these settlements most of the important powers of the world

have appeared before the court as litigants, and thus the tribunal has been securely established in the confidence of the nations. The awards in these four cases were loyally accepted by the governments against which they were rendered. This was true even in the Venezuela case, where the award was severely criticised by many as seemingly putting a premium on violence.[1]

In another way, also, the International Court has been strengthened in its prestige, and its permanence rendered more sure. Reference of disputes to it, under the Hague convention, is voluntary only. Nothing further than this could be accomplished in 1899, though a large number of governments were ready to go further. The signatory powers assumed no treaty obligations to bring their controversies before the tribunal, however strong their moral obliga-

[1] As this chapter is going to press the United States and Great Britain have reached an agreement to refer to the Hague Court the whole Newfoundland fisheries question.

tion, imposed by the creation of it, to use it for the ends for which it had been established. Almost immediately, therefore, after its establishment a movement was begun to secure treaties of obligatory arbitration between the nations, stipulating reference to the court of the disputes which might arise between them. This movement was really only the resumption, in a modified form, of that which had been going on for many years, and which had resulted in the unratified Anglo-American treaty of 1897, and the similar one of the same year between Italy and the Argentine Republic. The setting up, in the meantime, of the permanent Court of Arbitration had prepared the way for the conclusion of such treaties and made the work of securing them much easier than it had been prior to 1899. To this new appeal of the friends of peace, supported by the great business organizations of the different countries, the governments responded with unexpected alacrity and cordiality. Between December, 1899,

and the close of 1902 no less than fifteen treaties of obligatory arbitration were concluded; namely, those between the American republics, including the Pan-American conventions and the conventions concluded between Spain and nine Latin-American States, and the treaty between Mexico and Persia. These fifteen treaties did not, however, pledge reference of disputes to the Hague tribunal, as the South American states were not parties to the convention under which the court was set up. Great Britain and France, who had been perilously near to war over the Fashoda affair, and whose business men, led by Dr. Thomas Barclay, an ex-president of the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris, had created a powerful crusade among the chambers of commerce and boards of trade against the war excitement, took the lead in this movement so far as the Hague Court was concerned. On the fifteenth of October, 1903, a treaty of obligatory arbitration was concluded to run for five years and

to cover all disputes of a judicial nature and those arising in the interpretation of treaties. Following this initiative, other treaties of the same type were quickly signed, and by October, 1907, no less than forty-seven had been concluded, not to mention the eleven signed by the late Secretary Hay, which failed to go into effect because of the disagreement between President Roosevelt and the Senate as to their respective prerogatives as parts of the treaty-making power. Two of these treaties, the Danish-Netherlands and the Danish-Italian, are without limitations. They refer all disputes for all time to the Hague Court. One of the most recent of these treaties, that between Denmark and Portugal, is to run for ten years, but is otherwise unlimited. All of the nations of Western Europe have become parties to some of these treaties pledging reference of disputes to the Hague Court. One regrets to have to record that France and Germany, between whom the ancient prejudice and animosity are clearly

beginning to break down, have not yet reached a stage of friendly confidence where a treaty of arbitration can be concluded between them. But, with this exception, the nations of Western Europe have bound themselves together in a real bond of peace, though of a temporary and limited character.

It is not easy to appreciate the full force of this series of conventions in its bearings upon the future relations of the nations. It reveals a new spirit, a new order of conduct among the governments. This new disposition has already borne fruit in the remarkable diplomatic agreement between Great Britain and France for the settlement by arbitration or otherwise of all their outstanding differences, some of them very old and stubborn. It has manifested itself quite as impressively in the manner in which the North Sea affair between Great Britain and Russia was settled by an international commission of inquiry, as provided by the Hague convention; and even more

impressively still, if possible, in the pacific settlement of the Moroccan controversy between France and Germany (who had so long stood apart in irreconcilable opposition) by the conference at Algeciras, in which representatives of fourteen powers took part.

The fact that no fresh controversies have been settled by the Hague tribunal the past two years, a fact that has occasioned unfavorable comment, has its explanation in this same direction. The new spirit that is pervading international life not only leads to pacific adjustment of controversies when they arise, but it also operates to prevent them. It makes diplomacy active in allaying differences that might become serious. In this way the number of misunderstandings and disputes between the nations is already unmistakably decreasing, and in place of the former exclusiveness, recrimination and provocation of quarrels, a habit of genuine respect, appreciation and sympathetic association is rapidly forming. This

has manifested itself among heads of governments themselves and among statesmen, not only in political ways, but also by international visits of a social order such as have been unknown till recent years. That the Hague Court, therefore, should pass a year or two without being called upon to adjudicate any international dispute ought not to create any surprise. It is, on the contrary, the most convincing proof that the arbitration movement, as a special phase of the international peace movement, is nearing its completion, and that the new spirit which has accompanied and actuated its development, is rapidly producing among the nations that mutual respect and friendly coöperation which will make arbitration less and less necessary and possibly keep the Hague Court itself much of the time out of business. This would certainly not be an undesirable state of affairs. Arbitration of disputes is a most excellent thing, but so to live as to have no disputes to arbitrate and no differences which cannot be

easily adjusted by direct friendly conference is a "more excellent way."

But more significant still than any of the facts set forth above is the extraordinary development of general public sentiment in nearly all countries in favor of the speedy completion of the system of pacific settlement of disputes and of a closer unity and fuller coöperation of the nations in the treatment and disposition of the problems which concern their common interests. Since the Hague Conference of 1899 the proposition has been put forward in a practical way for the creation of a permanent periodic conference or parliament of nations. The unanimous action of the Massachusetts legislature in 1903 in this direction has found large support in both the United States and Europe among men of various callings. It has received the approval of all the leading organizations that are working for international peace, — namely, the International Peace Congress, the Interparliamentary Union, the Mohonk Arbitration

Conference, the National Peace congresses, and of many important business, social, religious and philanthropic bodies. It has commended itself to the judgment of men of affairs, as well as to idealists, as an entirely practicable scheme and absolutely necessary at the present time for the strengthening and further advancement of civilization. The many important intergovernmental congresses and conferences held since the Vienna Congress of 1815,[1] for the discussion and settlement of problems of great moment and urgency, have been aptly pointed to as furnishing the unanswerable argument for a regular international institution, in which these problems continually arising in the intercourse of nations may have thorough and adequate treatment.

The same intelligent sentiment which is

[1] In an able article in the *American Journal of International Law* for July 1907, Judge Baldwin, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Connecticut, has pointed out that there have been more than one hundred and twenty of these conferences since 1826.

calling for this great step, the creation of a world-assembly, is also demanding, even more insistently, that the nations shall go beyond what was done at The Hague in 1899 and enter into a general arbitration convention under the terms of which they shall solemnly bind themselves to refer to the Hague Court for settlement disputes which cannot be adjusted by diplomacy. It may be said without exaggeration that the voice of the civilized world is almost unanimous at the present time in favor of this important measure, which is necessary as the logical completion of the Hague Convention of 1899.

Another feature of the more recent development of the tendency towards international federation and coöperation for the promotion of the general welfare of humanity is the demand for the permanent neutralization of the private commerce of the world. Nothing in our time is more noteworthy than the vast expansion of international trade. In less than one hundred

years it has grown from a volume valued at $1,500,000,000 to an amount valued at the colossal sum of $20,000,000,000. The largest portion of this increase has been within the past generation. At the same time the conviction is deepening that this commerce, on which so much of the common people's welfare and happiness depends, should be kept free from the disturbing and ruinous influences of war, the very rumor of which in our complex social conditions works such widespread havoc. The demand is put forward both by men of affairs and by broad-minded philanthropists that the so-called "rights of belligerents" shall be so limited that when two governments engage in hostilities the rights of private citizens throughout the world to carry on the ordinary vocations unmolested shall not be interfered with in any serious way. The United States government has long held that all unoffending private property at sea should be exempt from capture in time of war. The Massachusetts State

Board of Trade has recently gone so far as to urge that the great trade routes of the ocean themselves should to this end be permanently neutralized. This growing consideration and respect for the rights and liberties of the masses of the people, for the promotion of which rather than for their own sake governments are now generally conceived to have their *raison d'être*, is the surest proof that war is to be ultimately eliminated from human society and that the parts of the world are more and more to live and think and move together as they have not done in the past. Even the unfortunate wars which have occurred since the Hague Conference of 1899 — wars whose roots went far back into the past and cannot with any fairness be turned into a reproach of the Hague institutions — have served to reveal in a most impressive way the growing spirit of oneness among different parts of the globe, and the increasing determination of the peoples of the different nations that the great and disastrous

disturbances to the general social and economic order caused by war shall not be allowed to repeat themselves hereafter. Not only was the Boer War strongly condemned at the time by the general opinion of international society, as well as by a powerful section of the British people, but the reaction against it in Great Britain followed with a swiftness and irresistible power, which has probably never before been known in connection with any such conflict. In the case of the war between Japan and Russia the same feeling of disappointment and grief as accompanied the South African tragedy, was also experienced, though in a somewhat more concealed way on account of the peculiar character of the conflict. The end of this gigantic struggle brought such a feeling of relief to the conscience and heart of the world as has never before been witnessed. This increasing sensitiveness of the public conscience of the world to the horrors and irrationality of war is perhaps the best guarantee that some ade-

quate method will speedily be found by which justice and honor may be truly satisfied and humanity spared the great burdens, both moral and material, which war now imposes.

The movement toward international federation has, on the whole, advanced more rapidly in the Western Hemisphere than in the Eastern. This is due, undoubtedly, to the fuller recognition of democratic principles and their wider incorporation in political institutions on this side of the globe. Since the Hague Conference of 1899 the Second and Third International American conferences have been held, that of Mexico City in 1901 and that of Rio Janeiro in 1906. The first Pan-American Conference was called ten years before the first Hague Conference, so much futher advanced was sentiment in this hemisphere than in the Eastern. The results of these American conferences have been many and varied, but by far the most important of them has been the establishment of what is essentially

a permanent international union of the American republics. This union, though only in its incipiency, is of vastly greater moment than the arbitration conventions or the commercial, educational and sanitary arrangements to which these states have given their assent, valuable as these are. It will, without doubt, in time practically destroy the distrust which has existed among them toward the United States, and the friction and unrest which has characterized the relations of some of them to each other. The strength of this Pan-American union will be greatly increased through the operation of the International Bureau of the American Republics, as reorganized by the Rio Conference of 1906. This Bureau is to have permanent quarters in Washington, for which, through the contributions of the different republics and Andrew Carnegie's generous gift of three quarters of a million dollars, a worthy building is soon to be erected.

The circumstances attending the calling and holding of the Second Hague Conference, which closed its sessions on October 18th, 1907, have emphasized in a most extraordinary way the strength of the various lines of influence which are working out the federative union of the world. This Conference was initiated by President Roosevelt at the urgent suggestion of the Interparliamentary Union at the time of its conference at St. Louis in 1904. Back of this initiative was a great body of international public sentiment, as there had not been to the same degree behind that of the Czar in 1899. This public sentiment, which in the interests of international justice and peace demanded a new conference, indeed a series of periodic conferences of the nations, and had been expressing itself in the years following 1899 with increasing volume and intensity, found its best and most effective instrument of expression in this great, well-organized union of statesmen, a body truly representative of the people in the various

countries to whose parliaments they belonged. The Second Conference at The Hague, therefore, met at the behest, not of a crowned head, or chief of state, but of the international democracy of our time. This popular character of the calling of the Second Hague Conference differentiated it strongly from the Conference of 1899, and is proof of a very great advance in a few years in the development of those forces which are leading the nations to wider and more sympathetic relations to each other and upon which their federation, when it comes, must depend for its solidity and permanence.

In the Second Hague Conference, furthermore, practically all the states of the world came together for the first time in a general conference for deliberation upon their mutual interests. The republics of South and Central America for the first time as a body met with the nations of Europe on a basis of political equality. This they had not been permitted to do in 1899.

They were not considered by the older European powers competent to meet with them in council concerning the great world problems which up to that time Europe had always considered it her prerogative to determine. This gathering of all the nations of the world in a common assembly is the most significant fact connected with the Second Hague Conference. This meeting, to which South America sent some of the ablest men who were present, has put an end to the old order of things in which the two hemispheres moved apart and had practically no bond of political union and coöperation. The world is henceforth, both morally and materially, to proceed on its way as a single, united world. In claiming and insisting upon their political equality with the European nations the South American countries made at The Hague a notable contribution to the cause of justice and peace. For the first time in history the small states had the opportunity unitedly to meet the pretensions of the great powers

to dictate, without the advice and consent of the small powers, the general international policies of the world. There is reason to believe that the Second Hague Conference has inaugurated an entirely new era in this regard, and that hereafter we shall see much less of the aggression and gross injustice of the strong powers towards the small and weak ones than in the past.

In the way of formal accomplishments the Second Hague Conference fell much short of what the advanced thought of the world expected of it, and even short of what a majority of the governments themselves were ready and, in a number of cases, even anxious to do. But what was accomplished in the thirteen conventions that were adopted was nevertheless all in the direction not simply of the restriction of war, but of wider international coöperation and control. The conventions dealing with war both on land and sea and those dealing with the rights and

duties of neutrals were all of a character to make it much more difficult than heretofore for any two nations to begin or to wage a war according to the dictates of their own passions and selfish ambitions. The whole body of the nations acting as a unit has laid its restraining hand upon war as has never before been done. This is an attainment of no mean significance. The establishment of an international prize court to supplant the *ex parte* national prize courts, which have hitherto dealt with captures at sea in times of war, is a long step toward wider joint international action. More conspicuously so is the treaty under whose stipulations contractual debts cannot hereafter be collected from a nation by force until the justice of the claims has been submitted to impartial arbitration. The world note is also heard in the conventions covering the laying of submarine mines, the bombardment of unfortified coast towns, the treatment of captured crews, and the inviolability of fishing fleets and of the postal

service. And it is the world note in all of these agreements, and not the mere formal thing that was done, that enables us to determine the true significance of the Conference.

But the real interpretation of the Conference is to be sought outside of these formal conventions. The great questions with which it dealt and in which were conspicuously manifested its high intellectual character and its lofty moral tone were the problems of the limitation of armaments, the creation of a permanent international tribunal of justice, the formulation of a general treaty of obligatory arbtration, and the establishment of a regular congress or parliament of the world. Any one who has followed the reports of the deliberations, and especially of the discussions which preceded the Conference, knows that these were the real subjects for the consideration of which it was called, the real subjects, too, on which it expended its best thought and energy, rather than those which were

formally on the program. It was these in which the peoples of the different nations were supremely interested, and it is no exaggeration to say that all these problems, though formal conclusions were not reached, were carried far forward toward their ultimate solutions. The principle of periodic Hague conferences was unanimously approved and the date of the third meeting practically fixed. That means the inauguration of the greatest possible institution in the direction of the definite federation and political organization of the world. The principle of a permanent international court of justice was likewise practically unanimously approved. This assures the world in a few years of a great tribunal which will not only serve the ends of justice among the nations, but also make universal peace more certain than it has ever yet appeared. The principle of obligatory arbitration of disputes was also formally incorporated in the convention in regard to the collection of contractual

debts, and a very large and powerful majority of the delegations also voted their approval of the principle in general, and desired its incorporation in a general treaty covering a considerable range of classes of controversies. It is not difficult to foresee, therefore, that we are within easy reach of a general convention of obligatory arbitration among the nations, covering practically all controversies except those which involve the national independence. In the meantime, the article that was, at the suggestion of the United States delegation, added to the convention of 1899, providing that one of two disputing states may apply directly to the Bureau of the Hague Court and ask for arbitration, will do much to increase the influence of the Court as it now exists, and to ensure the arbitration of disputes even between powers whose relations may have become embittered. This open appeal through the Hague Court to the public opinion of the world could hardly fail to

induce an unwilling nation to yield and allow the controversy to go before the great tribunal which the nations have established, and to which all the governments of the world are now parties.

Much more significance is to be attached to the resolution adopted in regard to the present rivalry of armaments than many suppose. The resolution voted is the solemn and unanimous voice of the governments of the world through their representatives at the Hague Conference that the present system of armaments has reached a development at which it ought to stop. This voice of the Conference will go out through all the world, and the governments, if they have a true sense of respect for the men whom they sent to the Second Hague Conference, will not allow the subject long to remain dormant, but will take it up and will have it seriously and thoroughly studied with the intention of reaching at the Third Hague Conference, or earlier, some practical solution of this, the most urgent and

burning question of international concern at the present time.

What the full results of the Second Hague Conference will be it is as yet impossible to forecast. It will require years for the full fruition. But any one who considers its meaning and its work in the light of its historic antecedents and the great movements which for centuries have been leading up to it, and its bearings upon the future relations and policies of the nations, cannot but believe that the federation of the world, which has so long been dreamed of and prophesied, is no longer a mere prophecy and a dream, but has already in very deed begun to exist. From the foundations now so well laid, both in general public opinion and in an as yet imperfect but real world institution which the Hague conferences have brought into being, one can easily picture to one's self the superstructure of the magnificent world temple of peace, which is to be thereon erected.

APPENDIX.

The Czar's Rescript calling for a Conference on Reduction of Armaments.

ISSUED AT ST. PETERSBURG BY COUNT MURAVIEFF ON THE 24TH OF AUGUST, 1898.

The maintenance of general peace and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations present themselves, in the existing condition of the whole world, as the ideal towards which the endeavors of all governments should be directed.

The humanitarian and magnanimous spirit of His Majesty the Emperor, my august Master, is wholly convinced of this view.

In the conviction that this lofty aim is in conformity with the most essential interests and the legitimate wishes of all the Powers, the Imperial Government thinks the present moment would be very favorable for an inquiry, by means of international discussion, as to the most effective means

of insuring to all the peoples the benefits of a real and durable peace, and, above all, of putting a limit to the progressive development of the present armaments.

In the course of the last twenty years, the longings for general appeasement have been particularly marked in the consciousness of the civilized nations. The preservation of peace has been put forward as the object of international policy. It is in its name that the great states have concluded among themselves powerful alliances. It is the better to guarantee peace that they have developed their military forces in proportions hitherto unknown, and still continue to increase them without shrinking from any sacrifice.

But all these efforts have not yet been able to bring about the beneficent results of the pacification desired.

The financial burdens, constantly increasing, strike at public prosperity at its very source. The intellectual and physical forces of the nations, and their labor and capital are, for the most part, diverted from their natural application and unproductively consumed. Hundreds of millions are employed in procuring terrible engines of destruction, which, though to-day regarded as the supreme attainment of science, are sure to-morrow to lose all value because of some new invention in this

field. National culture, economic progress and the production of wealth are paralyzed or checked in development.

So, too, in proportion as the armaments of each power increase do they less and less fulfill the object which the governments have had in view. Economic crises, due in great part to the system of armament *à outrance*, and the continual danger which lies in this accumulation of war material, are transforming the armed peace of our days into a crushing burden which the peoples have more and more difficulty in bearing. It seems evident that if this state of things continues it will inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is desired to avert, the horrors of which, even in anticipation, cause every thinking man to tremble.

To put an end to these incessant armaments, and to seek the means of warding off the calamities which threaten the whole world, is the supreme duty resting to-day upon all states.

Filled with this idea, His Majesty the Emperor has been pleased to command me to propose to all the governments which have accredited Representatives at the Imperial Court, the meeting of a conference which shall take into consideration this grave problem.

This conference will be, by the help of God, a happy presage for the century now about to open.

It will unite, and thus greatly strengthen, the efforts of all those states which sincerely seek to make the great conception of Universal Peace triumph over the elements of trouble and discord. It will at the same time cement them together by a joint consecration of the principles of equity and right on which rest the security of states and the welfare of peoples.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE following is intended to be only a good working list of books, pamphlets and periodicals. It is sufficiently extended to put any one who wishes to study the growth of the movement for the abolition of war and for the federation of the world into contact with the literature of the subject, which has recently become very abundant. It would be impossible to give in any reasonable space the names of the innumerable pamphlets which have appeared, and of the articles published in various periodicals, American and foreign, during the last fifteen years. Many of those omitted are quite as valuable as those here given. The list includes most of the leading classical works on the subject, many of which are now out of print.

LYMAN ABBOTT. Christianity and Social Problems. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1897.

AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, April, 1896. Report. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1896.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY. The Advocate of Peace, 1834– and other publications. Boston.

SHELDON AMOS. Political and Legal Remedies for War. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1880.

T. K. ARNOLDSON. Pax Mundi, translated by P. H. Peckover. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1892.

EDWARD ATKINSON. The Cost of a National Crime. Boston: The Author, 1898.

FREDRIK BAJER. Fredsvenneres Krigsplan. Copenhagen: Möller, 1891.

THOMAS BALCH. International Courts of Arbitration. Philadelphia, 1874: Allen, Lane & Scott, 1896.

ADIN BALLOU. Autobiography. Lowell, Mass.: Thompson & Hill, 1896. Christian Non-Resistance, 1846.

ROBERT BARCLAY. Apology, Proposition XV., Sect. 13. Philadelphia: Friends Bookstore.

GEORGE C. BECKWITH. The Peace Manual, or War and its Remedies. Boston: The American Peace Society, 1868.

EDWARD BELLAMY. Equality, Chaps. XXIV. and XXXIII. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1897.

JEREMY BENTHAM. A Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace, Principles of International Law, Part 4.

J. K. BLUNTSCHLI. Das Moderne Völkerrecht der Civilizirten Staten. Nördlingen, 1878. Die Bedeutung und die Fortschritte des Modernen Völkerrechts. Berlin, 1873.

GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN. Disarmament of Nations, or Mankind One Body. Philadelphia: The Author, 1898. Studies in the Mountain Instruction. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1881.

CHARLES LORING BRACE. Gesta Christi, a History of Humane Progress. New York: Armstrongs, 1893.

JOHN BRIGHT. Life and Times of Right Hon. John Bright. New York and London: Cassell & Co.

ELIHU BURRITT. Sketch of the Life and Labors of Elihu Burritt. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879.

THOMAS CARLYLE. Sartor Resartus, Book II., Chap. VIII.

F. G. CARTLAND. Southern Heroes, or the Friends in War Time. Cambridge, Mass.: Printed at the Riverside Press, 1895.

THOMAS CHACE. The Churches of Christendom responsible for the Continuance of War. Richmond, Indiana: The Friends Peace Association.

THOMAS CHALMERS. Thoughts on Universal Peace.

WILLIAM E. CHANNING. Essays on War, in Collected Works. Boston: Unitarian Publishing Association.

RICHARD COBDEN. Life of Richard Cobden, by John Morley. Boston: 1881. The Three Panics. London: Ward & Co., 1862.

ATHANASE COQUEREL. La Guerre.

GIUSEPPE D' AGUANO. L'abolition de la guerre, conséquence de la lutte pour l'existence. Milan, 1897.

COMTE E. GOBLET D'ALVIELLA. Désarmer ou déchoir. Paris: Guillaumin, 1872.

W. EVANS DARBY. International Tribunals, a Collection of various Schemes, and other Papers. London: The Peace Society.

E. DESCAMPS. Le droit de la paix et de la guerre. Paris: Arthur Rousseau, 1898. Essai sur l'organisation de l'arbitrage international. Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1898.

DEUTSCHE FRIEDENSGESELLSCHAFT. Monatliche Friedens-Correspondenz. Berlin.

ELIE DUCOMMUN. Le programme pratique des amis de la paix. Berne: Steiger & Co., 1895.

HENRI DUMESNIL. La guerre, étude philosophique. Paris: Guillaumin, 1872.

JONATHAN DYMOND. War, an Inquiry into its Causes, Consequences, Lawfulness, etc.

RICHARD T. ELY. Social Aspects of Christianity. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON. War, in "Miscellanies." Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

J. A. FARRER. Military Manners and Customs. London: Chatto & Windus, 1885.

GUGLIELMO FERRERO. Militarismo. Milan, 1898.

David Dudley Field. International Code. New York: Baker, Voorhis & Co., 1872. American Progress in Jurisprudence. New York, 1893.

John Fiske. The Destiny of Man. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

H. la Fontaine. Essai de bibliographie de la paix. Brussels: T. Sombaerts, 1891.

Alfred Hermann Fried. Elsass-Lothringen und der Krieg. Leipzig: A. Dieckmann, 1895.

William Lloyd Garrison. Life of William Lloyd Garrison, by his Sons. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Henry George. Progress and Poverty, Book X., Chap. III. New York: Henry George & Co.

Franklin Henry Giddings. The Principles of Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896.

Émile de Girardin. Le désarmement européen. Le désarmement général.

Ulysses S. Grant. Memoirs. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Grant in Peace, by Badeau, Chap. XXV. Hartford: S. S. Scranton & Co., 1887.

Hugo Grotius. De Jure Belli ac Pacis.

Geneva Convention, in Encyclopædia Britannica.

Edward Everett Hale. A Permanent Tribunal. Speeches in Mohonk Conference Reports, 1895, etc.

Arthur Helps. Conversations on War and General Culture. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

Sir Edmund Hornby. An International Tribunal. London: The Peace Society.

W. D. Howells. A Traveller in Altruria, and later Writings.

Victor Hugo. Address at the Paris Peace Congress in 1849.

International (Pan) American Conference. Reports, in four vols. Washington: State Department.

International Arbitration and Peace Association. Concord, and other Publications. London.

INTERNATIONAL LAW ASSOCIATION. Annual Reports. London: 1 Mitre Court Building, Temple.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE BUREAU. La correspondance bi-mensuelle. Berne.

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY PEACE UNION. La conférence interparlementaire. Berne.

WILLIAM JAY. War and Peace. London: Ward & Co. Review of the Mexican War. Boston: B. B. Mussey & Co., 1849.

AUGUSTINE JONES. War Unnecessary and Unchristian. Boston: The American Peace Society.

L. KAMAROWSKY. Le tribunal international. Paris: Durand et Pedone-Lauriel, 1887.

IMMANUEL KANT. Perpetual Peace (1795), translated by Benjamin F. Trueblood. Boston: The American Peace Society, 1897.

LEOPOLD KATSCHER. Frieden! Frieden! Frieden! Leipzig: E. Pierson.

WILLIAM LADD. Essay on a Congress of Nations. J. Hemmenway's Memoir of William Ladd, the Apostle of Peace.

P. LARROQUE. De la création d'un code de droit international et de l'institution d'un haut tribunal. Paris: Bellaire, 1875.

ÉMILE DE LAVELAYE. The Causes of War and the Means of reducing their Number, in Cobden Club Essays.

T. J. LAWRENCE. The Principles of International Law. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1895.

W. E. H. LECKY. Rationalism in Europe, Vol. II., p. 219. History of European Morals, vol. ii. p. 274.

CHARLES LEMONNIER. Les états-unis d'Europe. Paris, 1872.

P. LEROY-BEAULIEU. Recherches statistiques sur les pertes d'hommes et de capitaux. Paris: Guillaumin, 1868.

LEONE LEVI. War and its Consequences. London: Partridge & Co., 1887. Project of a Council and High Court of International Arbitration.

LIGUE INTERNATIONALE DE LA PAIX ET DE LA LIBERTÉ. Les états-unis d'Europe. Berne.

MAGALHAES LIMA. La fédération ibérique. Paris: Guillard, Aillaud & Co., 1892.

LONDON PEACE SOCIETY. The Herald of Peace, and other Publications. London.

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. The Arsenal at Springfield.

GEORGE C. LORIMER. Christianity and the Social State, Chap. XII. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL. The Biglow Papers. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

CHARLES LUCAS. Les deux rêves de Henri IV. Pau, France: E. Vignacour, 1873.

H. T. J. MACNAMARA. Peace, Permanent and Universal. London: Saunders & Otley, 1841.

TERENZIO MAMIANI. Di un Nuovo Diritto Internazionale. Turin, 1859.

DON ARTURO DE MARCOARTU. Internationalism. London: Stevens & Sons.

ANGELO MAZZOLENI. L' Italia nel Movimento per la Pace. Milan, 1891. La guerre est-elle nécessaire? Berne: Körber, 1892.

EDWIN D. MEAD. The New England Magazine, various Editorials, from 1896 on. Boston: Warren F. Kellogg. Principles of the Founders, Boston, 1903.

JAMES B. MILES. An International Tribunal. Boston: J. E. Farwell & Co., 1875.

MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE. Reports, 1895–. Lake Mohonk, N. Y.

G. DE MOLINARI. Grandeur et décadence de la guerre. Paris: Guillaumin, 1848.

E. T. Moneta. L'Utopia di Mazzini, la Morte di Guglielmo e la Pace. Milan: Edoardo Sonzogno, 1888.

A. Mongredien. Wealth Creation. London, 1882.

Charles de Secondat Montesquieu. L'esprit des lois.

John Bassett Moore. The Arbitrations of the United States. Boston: The American Peace Society, 1895. International Arbitrations, 1898. The Government.

Ch. Mougins de Roquefort. De la solution juridique des conflits internationaux. Paris: Rousseau, 1889.

Philip S. Moxom. The Social and Moral Aspects of War. Boston: The American Peace Society, 1893.

J. Novicow. Les luttes entre sociétés humaines. Paris: Felix Alcan, 1893. La guerre et ses prétendus bienfaits. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie, 1894.

Robert Treat Paine. Demand for a Simple System of Judicial Arbitration, Speech at the Philadelphia Conference, February, 1896. See Report.

A. J. Palm. The Death Penalty. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1891.

Benjamin Pandolfi (Marquis). La fédération et la paix. Rome: F. Setth, 1892.

Frederic Passy. La barbarie moderne. Paris: Guillaumin. La question de la paix. Guise: Baré, 1891.

A. P. Peabody. The Nature and Influence of War, Address before the American Peace Society, 1843.

William Penn. Essay toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe. 1693. Boston: The American Peace Society, 1897.

Philadelphia Conference on International Arbitration, February, 1896. Report. Philadelphia: The Universal Peace Union.

A. Pierantoni. Gli Arbitri Internazionali e il Trattato di Washington. Naples, 1872.

Sir Frederick Pollock. Essays in Jurisprudence and Ethics. New York: The Macmillan Co.

HODGSON PRATT. Arbitration versus War. Councils of Conciliation. London: The International Arbitration and Peace Association.

P. J. PROUDHON. La guerre et la paix, recherches sur le principe et la constitution du droit des gens.

JOSIAH QUINCY. The Extinction of War, Address before the Massachusetts Peace Society, 1820.

MICHEL REVON. Arbitrage international, son passé, son présent, son avenir. Paris: Arthur Rousseau, 1892.

HENRY RICHARD. Papers on the Reasonableness of International Arbitration. The Gradual Triumph of Law over Brute Force, and other Works. London: The Peace Society.

CHARLES RUSSELL (LORD CHIEF JUSTICE). Arbitration, its Origin, History and Prospects, Saratoga Address before the American Bar Association, 1896.

C. I. CASTEL SAINT-PIERRE (ABBÉ DE). Projet de paix perpétuelle.

IGNAZIO SCARABELLI. Cause di Guerra in Europa e Rimedi. Ferraro, Italy, 1890.

CARL SCHURZ. Arbitration in International Disputes, in "America and Europe." New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896.

GERRITT SMITH. Peace better than War. Address before the American Peace Society, 1858.

SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE POUR L'ARBITRAGE ENTRE NATIONS. Revue de la Paix. Paris.

DUC DE SULLY. The Great Design of Henry IV., Memoirs, Chapter III.

CHARLES SUMNER. The True Grandeur of Nations. The War System of the Commonwealth of Nations. The Duel between France and Germany. Boston: Ginn and Company.

BARONESS BERTHA VON SUTTNER. Lay down your Arms (Die Waffen Nieder). London and New York:

Longmans, Green & Co., 1894. Schach der Qual. Dresden: E. Pierson, 1898. Die Waffen Nieder (Monthly Journal). Vienna. Now Friedens-Warte.

VLADIMER TCHERTKOFF. Christian Martyrdom in Russia. London: The Brotherhood Publishing Co., 1897.

REUEN THOMAS. The War System in the Light of Civilization and Religion. Boston: The American Peace Society.

LEO TOLSTOY. War and Peace, and other writings.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD. William Penn's Holy Experiment, International Arbitration, its Present Status and Prospects. Boston: The American Peace Society. The Federation of the World. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1899.

OTTO UMFRID. Friede auf Erden. Stuttgart, 1897.

THOMAS C. UPHAM. The Manual of Peace. New York, 1836. Essay on a Congress of Nations.

UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS. Reports, 1889– Berne: The International Peace Bureau.

UNIVERSAL PEACE UNION. The Peacemaker. Philadelphia.

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE. The Wonderful Century, chapter "Militarism." New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898.

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT (BISHOP OF DURHAM). The Incarnation a Revelation of Human Duties. Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1892.

JOHN G. WHITTIER. Various poems on Peace and Disarmament.

NOAH WORCESTER. A Solemn Review of the Custom of War. The Friend of Peace, 1815–1827.

RECENT BOOKS.

JANE ADDAMS. Newer Ideals of Peace. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907.

RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN. World-Organization. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905.

ERNEST H. CROSBY. Tolstoy and his Message. Garrison the Non-Resistant. Chicago: The Public Publishing Company, 1905.

DAVID L. DODGE. War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905.

JOHN W. FOSTER. Arbitration and the Hague Court. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1904.

FREDERICK W. HOLLS. The Peace Conference at the Hague. New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1900.

LUCIA AMES MEAD. Patriotism and the New Internationalism. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1906.

J. NOVICOW. La Fédération de l'Europe. Paris: Felix Alcan, 1901.

WALTER WALSH. The Moral Damage of War. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1906.

THE ARBITER IN COUNCIL. Anonymous. London and New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

JUN 29 1966 76

IN STACKS

JUL 15 1966

JUL 9 '66 83 REC'D

LD 21A–60m-10,'65
(F7763s10)476B

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Trueblood
184995
84
TX953
.T73